

THE  
ANDOVER REVIEW

A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL  
MONTHLY

VOL. XVII.—JANUARY—JUNE.—1892

EDITORS

EGBERT C. SMYTH, J. W. CHURCHILL,  
WILLIAM J. TUCKER, GEORGE HARRIS,  
EDWARD Y. HINCKS,

*Professors in Andover Theological Seminary*

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

PROFESSORS JOHN P. GULLIVER, JOHN PHELPS TAYLOR,  
GEORGE F. MOORE, AND WILLIAM H. RYDER,

*Their Colleagues in the Faculty*



DETROIT, MICH.

BOSTON  
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

New York: 11 East Seventeenth Street

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge*

1892

Copyright, 1892,  
By HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

*All rights reserved.*

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.*  
Printed by H. O. Houghton & Company.

## CONTENTS.

---

- Apprentice System of the United States Navy, The. *Lieutenant Wadhams.* 35.  
 Attempt at Church Union in Japan, The. *Rev. Dwight W. Learned.* 464.  
 Authority in Religion, The Fountains of. *Rev. Frank R. Shipman.* 361.  
 Bishop Brooks. *Rev. Julius H. Ward.* 433.  
 Calvinistic System, The, in the Light of Reason and the Scripture. *Professor Schaff.* 329.  
 Christian Minister of To-day, The Mediating Function of the. *Rev. Philip S. Moxom.* 1.  
 Church and State in Canada. *Mr. George R. Stetson.* 476.  
 Congregational Churches, The Contribution of, to Modern Religious Life. *Wolcott Calkins, D. D.* 453.  
 Criminals, Possible Progression in the Punishment of. *Rev. William W. McLane.* 393.  
 Dr. A. Baer on Drunkenness, Views of. *Dr. Arthur McDonald.* 259.  
 Duddleian Lecture for the year 1891, The. *Professor Emerton.* 238.  
 Episcopal Church, The Contribution of the, to Modern Religious Life. *Rev. Fred-eric Palmer.* 376.  
 Ethical Resources, Our. *President Hyde.* 124.  
 Ethnic Religion in its Relation to Christianity. *Professor Gerhart.* 113.  
 Eudemonistic Ethics. A Reply. *Rev. Chauncey B. Brewster.* 293.  
 Grammar School Curriculum, The Proposed Reform of the. *Professor D. Collin Wells.* 47.  
 Great Love, The. *Christian Van Der Veen, D. D.* 57.  
 Greek Question at Cambridge, The. *Mr. Frank G. Moore, Ph. D.* 589.  
 Have we too Many Churches? *Rev. H. A. Bridgman.* 488.  
 Homer, The Figures of. *Miss Julia H. Caverno.* 146.  
 Leaders of Widening Christian Life and Thought. II. *John McLeod Campbell.*  
*Miss Agnes Maule Machar.* 549.  
 "Life in Himself:" A Meditation on the Consciousness of Jesus Christ. *Professor Tucker.* 186.  
 Local Church, The Expansion of the. *A. E. Dunning, D. D.* 12.  
 Missionary Problems in the Turkish Empire. *Rev. Charles C. Starbuck.* 23.  
 Missions and Civilization. I. *Rev. Charles C. Starbuck.* 496.  
 Missions within and without Christendom. *Rev. Charles C. Starbuck.* 277.  
 Morality: What is Better? *Amory H. Bradford, D. D.* 537.  
 Organized Revival among the Young, An. *Francis E. Clark, D. D.* 573.  
 Perfecting of Jesus, The. *Rev. Charles H. Dickinson.* 339.  
 Pessimism's Practical Suggestions to the Ministry. *Mr. Gerald H. Beard.* 272.  
 Prisoner, Reflections of a. 265.  
 Reality in the Pulpit. *Rev. Charles H. Cutler.* 580.  
 "Rembrandt as Educator." *H. C. Bierwirth, Ph. D.* 167.  
 Scientific Theology, The Duty of, to the Church of To-day. *Professor Pfei-derer.* 133.  
 The Christ and the Creation. *Rev. John Coleman Adams.* 225.

### EDITORIAL.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>Colonel Gardiner Tufts. 80.<br/>         Do Common Schools Educate?—Proposed Improvements. 197.<br/>         Dr. Parkhurst and the New York Police. 515.<br/>         Dr. Storrs's Ultimatum. 613.<br/>         How much did the American Board mean in granting to the Prudential Committee Liberty to ask "Supplementary Questions"? 312.</p> | <p>In Memoriam. Abraham Kuenen.—Paul Anton de Lagarde. 201.<br/>         Lewis French Stearns. 307.<br/>         Missionaries or "Cases"?—The Present Question in Regard to Applicants to the American Board. 410.<br/>         Noah Porter. 407.<br/>         Religious Authority. 298.<br/>         Social Christianity—The Andover House Association. 82.</p> |
|--|--|

- Social Legislation: The New Danish Poor-Law.—Belgian Councils of Arbitration. 609.
- The Approaching Election in the Province of Quebec. 207.
- The Christian Academy. 308.
- The Divinity of Christ. I. Introductory. 510.
- II. The Primitive Church. 598.
- The Recent Election in the Province of Quebec. 405.
- The Regression of the Critical Attack on the Deity of Christ. 402.
- The Roman Catholic Policy concerning Popular Education. 606.
- The Teaching of Jesus as related to that of the Apostles. 70.
- The Theological Restiveness of Ultra-Conservatives. 75.
- Why not clear our April Holiday of Religious Pretense? 513.

## BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

- Mark XVI. 9-20 and John VII. 53-VIII. 11. *A. P. Peabody, DD., LL. D.* 631
- Paul's Rabbinic Education. *Rev. Samuel Weyler.* 88.

## NOTES ON CURRENT CRITICAL DISCUSSIONS.

- Discussions upon the Fourth Gospel. *Rev. Charles C. Starbuck.* 419.

## SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.

- The University Settlement Idea. *Mr. Robert A. Woods.* 98.
- The Tee-to-tum Movement. *Mr. H. Otto Thomas.* 415.

- NOTES FROM ENGLAND. *Mr. Joseph King, M. A.* 318, 518.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

- Bixby's The Crisis in Morals. *J. H. Hyslop.* 213.
- Booth's Labor and Life of the People. *Robert A. Woods.* 221.
- Buhl's Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments. *George F. Moore.* 220.
- Caldecott's English Colonization and Empire. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 324.
- Carter's Mark Hopkins. *W. E. Merri-man.* 533.
- Cheyne's The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter. *John Phelps Taylor.* 218.
- Clark's Savonarola. *M. B. Norton.* 531.
- Earle's The Sabbath in Puritan New England. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 224.
- Froude's The Divorce of Catherine of Aragon. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 430.
- Godard's Poverty, its Genesis and Exodus. *J. H. Hyslop.* 529.
- Hardy's Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima. *M. L. Gordon.* 106.
- Henry's Patrick Henry. *Charles A. Starbuck.* 638.
- Henty's A Dash for Khartoum. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 223.
- Henty's Held Fast for England. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 223.
- Holtzmann's Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament. *George F. Moore.* 100.
- Knox's A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 321.
- Lavisse's General View of the Political History of Europe. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 321.
- MacRealsham's Romans Dissected. *Owen H. Gates.* 522.
- Müller-Simonis' Relation des Missions Scientifiques de MM. Hyvernat et Müller-Simonis. *Mervin-Marie Snell.* 527.
- Muirhead's The Elements of Ethics. *J. H. Hyslop.* 526.
- Murray's An Introduction to Ethics. *J. H. Hyslop.* 104.
- Pierson's The Divine Enterprise of Missions. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 326.
- Spalding's Education and the Higher Life. *M. B. Norton.* 528.
- Spencer's Justice. Being Part IV. of the Principles of Ethics. *J. H. Hyslop.* 216.
- Things to Come. *Robert A. Woods.* 215.
- Wilheboer's Die Entstehung des Alttestamentlichen Kanons. *George F. Moore.* 103.
- Winsor's Christopher Columbus. *Charles C. Starbuck.* 640.
- Woods's English Social Movements. *James M. Whiton.* 429.

NOTE. 195.

BOOKS RECEIVED. 109, 327, 431, 536, 644.





1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

11.

12.

13.

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XVII.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER XCVII.

JANUARY, 1892

## CONTENTS

1. THE MEDIATING FUNCTION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTER OF TO-DAY. <i>Rev. Philip S. Moxon</i> . . . . .	1
2. THE EXPANSION OF THE LOCAL CHURCH. <i>A. E. Dunning, D. D.</i> . . . .	12
3. MISSIONARY PROBLEMS IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE. <i>Rev. Charles C. Starbuck</i> . . . . .	23
4. THE APPRENTICE SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY. <i>Lieutenant Wadhams</i> . . . . .	35
5. THE PROPOSED REFORM OF THE GRAMMAR SCHOOL CURRICULUM. <i>Professor D. Collin Wells</i> . . . . .	47
6. THE GREAT LOVE. <i>Christian Van Der Veen, D. D.</i> . . . .	57
7. EDITORIAL.	
THE TEACHING OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THAT OF THE APOSTLES . . . . .	70
THE THEOLOGICAL RESTIVENESS OF ULTRA-CONSERVATIVES . . . . .	75
COLONEL GARDINER TUFTS . . . . .	80
SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY—THE ANDOVER HOUSE ASSOCIATION . . . . .	82
8. BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.	
PAUL'S RABBINIC EDUCATION. <i>Rev. Samuel Weyler</i> . . . . .	88
9. SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.	
THE UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENT IDEA. <i>Mr. Robert A. Woods</i> . . . . .	98
BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.	
Holtzmann's Hand-Commentar zum neuen Testament, 100.—Wildeboer's Die Entstehung des Alttestamentlichen Kanons, 103.—Murray's An Introduction to Ethics, 104.—Hardy's Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima, 106.	
11. BOOKS RECEIVED . . . . .	109

BOSTON

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET

*The Riverside Press, Cambridge*

LONDON: WARD, LOCK, BOWDEN & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter

TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00



D339 Public Library 92\*2

# THE ANDOVER REVIEW:

*A Monthly Magazine of Religion, Theology, Social Science,  
and Literature.*

EDITED BY

EGBERT C. SMYTH, J. W. CHURCHILL,  
WILLIAM J. TUCKER, GEORGE HARRIS,  
EDWARD Y. HINCKS,

*Professors in Andover Theological Seminary,  
Andover, Mass.*

With the coöperation of their colleagues in the Faculty, and  
with the assistance of a large staff of  
general contributors.

---

"The most valuable theological magazine published on this continent." — *The Week* (Toronto, Canada).

"*The Andover Review* is making theology of interest to those who are not theologians." — *New York Times*.

"Whoever, minister or layman, is long conversant with this monthly must become an intelligent and progressive Christian." — *Zion's Herald*.

"There is no periodical which seems to us more alive." — *The Literary World*.

"*The Andover Review* is one of the ablest and most timely of the monthlies." — *New York Evangelist*.

"We know of no other similar publication that more faithfully represents the dominant convictions of the great masses of Christian people concerning the life, duty, and conduct of practical religion." — *The Churchman*.

"It has been the means of furnishing more inspiration, higher ideals, a more determined purpose in the work of the ministry, than almost anything else which has been published." — *A New England Pastor*.

"It has not only lived to see a great change in the tone and spirit of orthodoxy in our land, but has had a leading and vast influence in producing this change. *The Andover Review* has still a great work to do, and promises more than ever of interest and ability." — *Springfield Republican*.





THE  
ANDOVER REVIEW:

*A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.*

VOL. XVII.—JANUARY, 1892.—No. XCVII.

---

THE MEDIATING FUNCTION OF THE CHRISTIAN  
MINISTER TO-DAY.

THE continuity of the Christian ministry and the permanence of certain elements with which it deals, as the main facts of revelation on the one hand and the main qualities of human nature on the other, give it a certain stableness of position and work. Yet each age in the history of the world needs, as each age produces and trains, its own peculiar ministry. The Christian work of to-day must be done by men of to-day. The Christian ministry must be far more vital than institutional. The business of the ministry is to lead in the realm of the moral and spiritual ideas and activities of men. It has a true prophetic function to fulfill. It should be always in advance of the times; not so far in advance as to be out of touch with the great common life of the world, but ahead,—thinking larger and higher thoughts and uttering them, feeling finer and holier emotions and manifesting them, apprehending better ideals of individual and social conduct and attempting them. The ministry is to be prophetic, not in utterance only, but in life, and so capable of leading men onward in the process of realizing the kingdom of God.

Naturally the minister's formal training is determined by the prevalent idea of his function. His self-training will be determined by his own idea of his function. If that idea is large, and high, and progressive, his self-training will broaden toward the breadth, and rise toward the height, and advance with the propulsive force, of his idea. I speak of the minister's *self-training*, for that is the most important part of his training. All that is done for him by college and seminary is necessarily subordinate

to that which he does for himself ; or rather, the extent and the value of what is done for him are determined by what he does for himself. He is not merely passive and receptive ; he is active and creative, if he is alive, if the true prophetic impulse has wakened in his soul. The school can make theologians, and scholars, and writers, perhaps, but not preachers, prophets, and leaders, unless in the students there is the true perception of their calling and a persistent reaching toward its powers and ends.

I purpose in this paper to set forth some thoughts on the function of the Christian minister, in the light of the conditions and needs of the time in which we live. Whatever value this study may have will lie not in any novelty of fact or principle, if that were possible in connection with so worn a theme, but in the expression which it gives to some results of experience, and in a deep sympathy with the perplexed, passionate, and struggling social life in the midst of which to-day the Christian minister's work must be done.

1. The function of the Christian minister is *to preach*: that is, to announce clearly and constantly the great facts of the gospel. These facts — the love of God for men revealed in and through Jesus Christ, the exposure and defeat of sin by the cross, the forgiveness of sins, the vision of faith, and the realization of the eternal life — are not mere remembered incidents or announcements of a bygone age ; they are elements in actual and present experience ; and as such have all the newness and force of fresh facts and communications. The preacher of these is not a mere witness of something past. He testifies of that which is. Every essential fact of the gospel is reproduced in the sphere of man's inner experience as he enters into the Christian life. The office of the Spirit is, in part, to revitalize ancient and factual revelation and pour it into the soul as a new communication. The perpetuity of preaching is grounded just in the reality of this process. Preachers are not called merely to iterate and reiterate past incidents, happenings that belong to a remote age and an archaic phase of life. The living voice and magnetic personality are not needed for such work. It is because revelation is ever renewed through the spirit of man, and ever bodies itself in facts of inward experience, that men continue to be in any real sense "witnesses of the resurrection," and that their word can be, now as of old, "the power of God unto salvation." The preacher declares not merely what he has learned from a book, but what he has seen and felt and known. His testimony is like that of St.



John, save in the entirely subordinate particular of material contact, — "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you."

This direct, personal testimony, this declaration of facts which have reappeared in the sphere of his own spiritual experience, must always be the first and most important part of the minister's function. It is this which gives power and efficiency to all the rest of his work. It is his experience of revelation, above everything else, that qualifies him as the ambassador of Jesus Christ. It is this which makes his utterance prophetic — a speaking for God.

Real preaching can never be perfunctory; it can never become merely traditional or didactic; and it can never lose its power over the human soul; because it has its spring in a continuous personal experience of divine communion and communication. A failure to appreciate his immediate relation to Christ, and to find the perpetual authentication of his message in that experience by which revelation becomes a spiritual process in his own soul, makes the minister a mere echo of other men's thoughts and a mere reporter of external and remote facts. He may still be a priest administering sacraments, but he is no more a prophet upon whom rests the precious and mighty "burden of the word of the Lord." He may be a valuable instructor of his fellow-men in many sorts of knowledge, but he misses the chief power and the chief glory of his calling. The true liberty of the pulpit is not in the license which may be given it by councils or presbyteries to declare this or that form of theological or ecclesiastical opinion, but in that immediate apprehension of God and of Christ, and that personal experience of revelation, which raise the preacher's mind into a realm above dogma and precedent and make his speech an original testimony to divine reality. This liberty is the realization of Christ's words, "ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," and "if the son make you free ye shall be free indeed;" and of the apostle's words, "where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

*To preach*, then, to declare the great facts of the gospel out of an experience in which those facts have been reproduced, and have become new and vital, is the first part of the Christian minister's work.

2. It is the function of the Christian minister *to teach*. Testimony is to be explicated and enforced by teaching. The facts of the gospel are the bases of Christian principles. The facts verify

themselves to consciousness in experience; they are also to be justified to reason as concrete expressions of great principles of thought and life. The teaching of the Christian pulpit is, thus, a rational exposition of the truths of revelation and the application of these truths to life. This is a continuous work. It is not properly theological. The theologian seeks a coherent, and as far as may be complete, system of thought, — a philosophy of God and humanity in their mutual relations. The teaching of the Christian minister is always practical in its aim. It terminates not on knowledge, merely, but on life. His perpetual effort is to secure the application of doctrines to conduct, and the consequent realization of doctrines in deed and character, in quality and power of life.

It is a main characteristic of Christianity that, as every essential fact on which it rests may be reproduced in experience, so every essential doctrine that it sets forth may be embodied and expressed in life. Just here we discover a powerful corrective of speculative tendencies in theology. The end of truth is *being*. The highest form of truth is in personality. Jesus said, "I am the truth." He was not using figure of speech. Truth as principle is truth unrealized. It must be taken up and transmuted into quality and force of being. Life, therefore, and not logic, is the supreme test of doctrines. Doctrines that have no relation to conduct and cannot be incorporated in character are valueless; if not meaningless.

The Christian minister must teach continually with this thought in mind, that the true outcome of his teaching is better life. This thought will keep him close to reality. It will unify all his work. It will make his presentation of religion full and strong, able to touch men on every side. His work is much more than ethical; it is spiritual, and therefore ethical. The morality of Christ is righteousness. Righteousness is the expression of holy love, in disposition and action, in all the relations of life. Religion is not "morality touched with emotion," but it is morality created and suffused by that love of God and man which is at once emotion, intelligence, and will. The distinction between doctrinal preaching and practical preaching is not a valid distinction. Christian doctrine, or teaching, is always practical. Here, at least, "theory" should never be divorced from "practice." The need of truths to believe is fundamentally a need of truths to live. Jesus said to those who professed to follow Him: "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?" These words are full

of suggestion to the minister of Christ. As a teacher he should seek continually so to present truth as to awaken in his hearers the impulse to do and to become. The relation of truth to life at once discloses the breadth of the minister's field. His teaching must be as broad as the whole sphere of human life, because the gospel addresses itself to the whole not only of man's need, but even of his possibility. Every question concerning man in his relations to God or to his fellow-men is fundamentally a moral question. This fact at once relates the minister as a teacher to every such question.

As Christian preaching demands in the preacher an inward experience of the facts he announces, so Christian teaching demands in the teacher both experience and discipline. The discipline involves wide knowledge, careful judgment, penetrating insight, profound sympathy, and unflinching courage. The minister is ever a learner and ever an experimenter; that is, he is continually testing truth in his own conduct, and continually observing the operation of moral principles and forces in the life of society. For he does not stand apart from his fellow-men; he is incorporate with them. There is one law for pulpit and pew; one standard of righteousness and one fountain of grace for clergyman and layman; and this oneness of obligation and resource at once binds the Christian teacher to his fellow-men and holds his teaching close to life. So great is the sphere of the Christian minister as teacher that, though by ignorance or unfaithfulness he may sink below it, he can never rise above it, nor reach beyond its far-lying limits. So large is this function that, to fill it rightly the Christian teacher must be in sympathy with all truths, and seek to coördinate them with the great central truths of revelation; and he must have the skill to apply truth to condition with such certainty as to disclose at once its divine and sovereign efficacy. Then under his teaching life will be modified as the soil and its growths are modified under the sunshine and the rain and the diligent hand of the husbandman.

3. It is the function of the Christian minister *to lead*. On this point I shall have little to say, partly because methods of leadership in the church are to a great extent determined by forms of ecclesiastical organization. In a word, it is the minister's business to lead; that is, to organize, direct, and wield the forces of the church for the accomplishment of the large ends which are set before the church by the command and manifest purpose of Christ. I say it is the minister's business *to lead*. That is an im-

portant part of his function. He is not to be the mere echo of a certain set of opinions which his congregation may formally hold; no more is he to be the mere executor of methods which that congregation may have adopted. At the present time it is specially important that Protestant ministers should wisely magnify their office — and fill it. At no time has there been greater need than now of strong and intelligent leadership. The minister *will* lead, if he has a true and high idea of his calling and the courage that is born of a free and full consecration. He *must* lead, if the church is to be steadily efficient in its work of realizing in human society the kingdom of God. He is the ambassador of Christ. Let him never yield to any clamor for a sensationalism that fills the pews with seekers after novelties and puts the Christian meeting-house into competition with the lecture-platform and the play-house. Let him never be the mere creature of a standing-committee which has an eye mainly to the receipts from sittings and not to the divine mission of the church to the ignorant and sinful. Let him never accept the domination of that spirit which says that his sole business is to secure material and social prosperity for the particular church which he serves. It is his duty, as it is his privilege, to multiply himself in the service of Christ and of men, through the members of his church. But Christian churches do not exist for their own sake, but for humanity's sake. They are constituted for the salvation of the world. Like an army, they exist not for the comforts of camp-life and the pleasures of parade, but for the prosecution of a campaign and the achievement of a conquest.

The social, industrial, and political life of to-day makes a demand upon the Christian church for enlightened and self-sacrificing service that is but feebly met. Never before has the church had such an opportunity as now to justify its existence and to prove its divine mission. Its opportunity brings also its great peril. Pastorates of churches, if ever they were, are not now sinecures. Never were pastors so taxed and strained by exhausting demands and heavy burdens as now; and never was there more urgent need of skillful and courageous leadership. The solution of social problems lies in the genuine gospel of Christ. The leadership which shall bring this gospel, with the organized force of the whole church, into efficacious contact with the great masses of restless and eager people who are reaching half blindly after a better social life, and the almost equally great multitudes who have not wakened to reach after anything save the daily crust, is a leadership which is almost desperately needed.

But the function of the Christian minister includes much that thus far I have not mentioned. There is that beneficent and fruitful service which he renders to his people in the close and tender relation of pastor. All this I pass by for the present that I may hasten to the consideration of a special work which the Christian minister of to-day must do, a special function that he must at least attempt to fulfill. This may be called his *MEDIATIVE FUNCTION*.

(1.) In an important sense the Christian minister is called upon to-day to mediate between Christianity and culture, or, more explicitly, between Christian thought and that thought in philosophy, science, and literature which, while not often essentially anti-Christian, is, or at least, through a misunderstanding, I believe, names itself non-Christian. The common conception of Christianity has been too much qualified by dogmatic ideas. Christianity, it cannot be repeated too often, is not a theology; it is not, as Dr. Mulford so clearly pointed out, even a religion; it is a revelation and a life. It implies a great and growing theology; it has stimulated the production of many theologies; but it is more than any or all of these. Faith has been confounded with belief of creeds and confessions. But faith in God existed before formulas. Dogma is historically posterior to faith. It is the result of an endeavor to express faith in terms of the understanding. The relations between faith and dogma are not accidental. A theology is an inevitable product of serious and prolonged thought upon God and life. But no theology has exhaustively stated, or can exhaustively state, even the rational contents of sacred Scripture, much less the spiritual contents of the progressive revelation which Christianity is. Now it is the function of the Christian minister, in whose experience the essential facts of Christianity have been reproduced as vital elements of his spiritual life, to interpret Christianity with such elemental simplicity and breadth as will enable sincere minds everywhere to coördinate their scientific thinking with their religious thinking; to show, by the vital method of Jesus himself, the essential nature of the gospel, and thus to disclose the real comprehensiveness of the fundamental Christian idea. A vast and difficult task this is, indeed, but not an impossible task, especially not impossible in very many individual cases, and a task that even now is being prosecuted with cheering success in the field of apologetic and constructive Christian literature. But there can be no substitute for the interpretative work which

a large-minded, highly cultivated, and wholly consecrated ministry can do. The personal element must always enter largely into the most efficacious exposition of Christian truth. The man informed and sublimed by the truth of Christianity is the mightiest apologist. The Christian thinker in whom revelation has become experience, and whose insight is the result of culture quickened by communion with the divine Spirit, is the most powerful interpreting and reconciling force in the realm of thought. There is a power in personality that is not communicable through the printed page. The true function, then, of the exponent of Christianity is not that of criticism and attack, but of interpretation, comprehension, and reconciliation. Christianity is hospitable to every sincere and earnest thought. It welcomes every discovery of truth, and has a place for every real addition to man's knowledge of himself and of the world. The sun coördinates with itself every planet and every satellite in the solar system; so Christ, when He is known, draws to himself every truth-loving personality, and by his revelation of God unites in one harmonious whole the unnumbered, varying truths, or fragments of truth, that during all the centuries have shone upon the waking and questioning mind of man.

With Christ the Christian minister stands at the centre of the moral universe. As Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, is the mediator between God and man, interpreting God to man, and man to himself, and drawing man by his reconciling power into fellowship with God, so the preacher of Christ is the true mediator between Christianity and culture, reconciling the multi-fold and varying thoughts of sincere men with the central truth which appears in the embodied love and righteousness of God.

(2.) Inseparable from what precedes is the function of the Christian minister as a mediator between "the church" and what, without discrimination, often is called "the world." As a visible and formal organization, the church is far from being inclusive of all those whose spiritual affinities ally them with Christ and with essential Christianity. There is a vast multitude of what Horace Bushnell called "outside saints," men and women who are striving to live the life of the spirit, but whose names are not on any church roll, and whose force is not operant in the organic life and work of the church. The causes of this separation of forces that belong together may be found on this side and on that. Some of them are in the narrowness and inflexible ecclesiasticism of local churches, and the ignorance or bigotry of church mem-



bers; some of them are in the ignorance or misunderstanding or even bigoted antipathy to creed of those outside. But, be the causes what they may, they are largely removable without the sacrifice of any Christian principle in the church, or any sincere conviction in the minds of those outside. In every community are many men who ought to be, and who might be, brought into organic relation with "the body of Christ." Here, then, is the sphere for a work of mediation by the Christian minister, which, faithfully done, would result in immensely strengthening the practical force of Christianity in society. Wisdom, love for men, and skill in putting emphasis where it belongs on the essentials of Christian faith and life, are qualities which the true minister, the minister who enters most deeply into the spirit of his Master, will cultivate and successfully use in this work.

(3.) In the same general line is the important function of mediation between churches, and between denominations of churches. The organic unity of all Christian churches is to many an Utopian dream. To some it is even an evil to be avoided at any risk. I do not care to discuss the question here. But this may be said without risking dispute, that formal and organic unity of all Christian churches will never come, save as the final result and expression of a triumphant unity of spirit. Such unity of spirit is certainly a condition to be sought with zeal and persistence. Such unity is now, happily, a state that can be realized to a degree far beyond any attained in the history of many hundred years. The preacher of the gospel is not first the creature and advocate of a sect, but a minister of Jesus Christ. He is not, or ought not to be, first a Baptist or a Congregationalist or an Episcopalian, but a Christian. More than that, he is a preacher and teacher of those fundamental Christian facts and principles which are essentially unifying and not divisive. His authority is not derived through any mere historical continuity of office, but through his immediate relation to Christ and his personal experience of revelation. The continuity of the Christian ministry inheres in the continuity of the divine purpose to save the world. Its essential power is an immediate endowment. Over all the claims of the local church, or the sect, or the great historic institution, is the present claim of humanity and the present claim of God. The end of the minister's endeavor is the salvation of men in the broadest sense, which is, in other words, the realization in society of the kingdom of God. In reaching toward this end he may — shall I not say he must? — mediate between the

mutually unsympathetic, if not discordant, churches, and, by imparting a better knowledge and a larger purpose and a sweeter spirit than they all now possess, lead them up to a higher plane of religious thought and work on which their divided and often rival forces will unite in harmonious endeavor to fulfill their mission in the world, and to penetrate and transform all society by the power of the gospel of love. What strengthening of weak places in the Christian line, what rallying of discouraged bands of workers, and what retrenching of enormous material and moral waste would such a unity accomplish!

(4.) Perhaps the most important feature of the mediative function which belongs to the Christian ministry to-day is that which concerns the relation to each other of social classes. After a hundred years of industrial individualism, the civilized world is approaching a crisis of transition. The transition is already in process. Competition in production and trade, which has ruled almost unchecked for so long a time, is already ominously manifesting its inadequacy as a general principle for the regulation of the commercial and industrial relations of society. Combination on a gigantic scale has arisen to check the working of competition. Unlimited competition has proved itself intolerable. Under the competitive industrial system wealth has massed itself enormously in relatively few hands, and with the rapid increase of population a vast body of wage-earning laborers has formed, which is swiftly consolidating into a sharply defined class, with class instincts, jealousies, and discontents. The industrial condition of to-day is one of open war, or of armed and uneasy truce. On one side are capitalists, great land-owners, and employers; on the other side are the great multitude of more or less compactly organized wage-earners. Meantime there are strong tendencies developing in the direction of nationalism and other forms of socialism, and even of anarchism. Whatever view we may take as to the best system of social organization, we are compelled to admit that the present system is not permanent, and is rapidly becoming unendurable. The outlook is such as to make the most careful and conservative students of social questions anxious, and the most hopeful serious. A great social conflict is imminent. On one side are wealth, intelligence, and the power that belongs to possessions and intelligence. On the other side are relative, to a large extent extreme, poverty, ignorance, and the power of numbers and increasing solidarity. Both sides are represented in the churches; though it must be confessed that the former is more largely and



much more influentially represented in Protestant churches than the latter. A vast number of the poor are alienated from the churches, and many of these the churches at present seem to have no capacity or skill to reach.

The only solvent of the social problem which can be entirely efficacious is the diffusion and realization of practical Christianity throughout society. The golden rule, the law of love, applied equally by rich and poor, by employer and employed, by capitalist and wage-earner, will alone radically remove the difficulty. But such a diffusion of Christianity is a work of time and labor and self-sacrifice.

I state the problem, or suggest it rather, not to discuss it at length, but to give a clear setting to the proposition that Christian ministers are called upon to-day, more imperatively than ever before, to mediate between conflicting social classes, and to render the most effective aid in solving the social problem; to contribute, perhaps to an extent beyond that attainable by any other class of men, in making the social transition, already in process, peaceful and beneficent to all concerned. The position of the minister is one of moral independence, and, as the exponent of Christianity, one of highest moral authority. By his love for men he is saved from narrow partisanship. By his supreme obligation to God he is lifted above fear. Bound by closest ties of sympathy to men, irrespective of their circumstances, he is in a position to speak to them with utter plainness and powerful persuasiveness. His daily life lets him deeply into the inner life of men. Now is his supreme opportunity. Now he must turn on the economic relations of men the clear light of Christian truth. Now, with pity for the weak, sympathy for the suffering, respect for the upright, and warning and rebuke for the willfully evil, but with a love, as of Christ himself, for all, he must counsel, instruct, and persuade with the truth and wisdom of Christ and the power and patience of pure self-sacrifice. He must help men to understand each other, to see each other's rights, and to recognize and fulfill their own duties. He must not be swerved from the right by applause, nor cowed by threats, nor bought by favors. For him wealth must have no glamour, and poverty no terrors. He must inculcate justice in the spirit and according to the ideal of the supreme law of all human relations: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

But beyond his faithful preaching of righteousness and love, he must endeavor to know the facts of the economic condition of

society. These he may know. No man, save the professional economist, has better opportunity, if he will take it, to know the elements of the social problem, than the Christian minister, and no one is better qualified to judge fairly and rightly. If he is not so qualified, it is his own fault. The day is past when men ought to be able to say that the minister knows nothing about business. It is his duty to know about men, and the occupations, ambitions, needs, and temptations of men. He should be a careful and continuous student of social and industrial life. He should be able to discover and understand social tendencies, and he should have the courage, the wisdom, and the force to guide men to sound thinking and unselfish action. He should keep the high ground of the great Christian ethics, despite the sneer, often, alas! from professedly Christian lips, that the Sermon on the Mount is impracticable, and he should apply the Christian ethics unflinchingly to the transactions of the market as well as of the saloon.

Thus will he stand before the people as a true friend of all men, and the veritable prophet of the living God. It is scarcely too much to say, that no special work of the Christian minister to-day is more important or more imperative than that of being a wise, faithful, and sympathetic mediator between his fellow-men in the social and industrial crisis that is almost, if not quite, upon us.

*Philip S. Moxom.*

Boston.

---

## THE EXPANSION OF THE LOCAL CHURCH.

THAT important changes in the organization of churches are soon to take place is beyond question. They are already too general to be treated as exceptions. They consist in plural ministries for local churches, with lay helpers of various kinds; and in providing for various physical, intellectual, and social as well as spiritual wants of the congregation. The demand for these changes, and the tendency to meet it, are alike general and growing. Public attention is fixed on a few conspicuous examples, as the Berkeley Temple in Boston, St. George's and St. Bartholomew's in New York, the People's Tabernacle in Jersey City, and the Grace Temple in Philadelphia. But the impulses and purposes here illustrated are becoming active in all our cities, and are beginning also to appear in country places.

The idea of reorganizing the churches so as to secure for them greater influence and efficiency in proportion to their investments of men and money is no mere scheme of an individual mind. It has found expression recently independently, and in various forms, in different sections of this country and in other countries. In the "Andover Review" for November, 1890, was an article entitled "The Reorganization of Congregational Churches," which proposed the union of the churches of one district under one pastor, with such assistants as he might need to sustain several places of worship, and to cultivate thoroughly the parish thus constituted. The plan there outlined has been extensively discussed in religious periodicals, and in local and state conferences. It has met with various objections, but in many quarters has been received with hearty favor. Better still, it has been put into practical operation in several places, and so far as heard from, with at least encouraging promise of success. Several home missionary superintendents have declared their conviction that it offers a solution of some of their most serious problems, and their desire to try it on a large scale. I will try to indicate the progress of the idea in practice, as I have followed it during the past year.

The most interesting experiment in this line which has come under my notice is now going on at Newport, N. H. This town is situated in Sullivan County, whose population has slowly and steadily declined for the last thirty years. The Congregational churches have also weakened, partly because of the loss of population, and partly because of lack of mutual interest and of centralization. Fifty years ago there were Congregational churches in thirteen towns, all with settled pastors. Last year there were only ten churches, of which six had pastors, and only two of these churches supported their ministers with funds entirely of their own raising. The Newport church, under the lead of its pastor, Rev. G. F. Kenngott, last spring instituted regular Sunday afternoon services in two villages, and assisted in supporting services in a third. At each of these a company from the Christian Endeavor Society of the Newport church regularly attended as assistants.

During the last summer three students from Andover Seminary were associated with Pastor Kenngott in maintaining services in several of the adjoining towns. They visited from house to house, organized Sunday-schools and Christian Endeavor Societies, and conducted schoolhouse meetings. In each town the pastor and the students held a continuous series of meetings for a week.

Each of the students preached in exchange with the pastor while he administered the communion in the country churches. The attendance and interest both in the central church and in the outlying districts increased so steadily, and the general results have been so satisfactory, that Pastor Kenngott felt obliged last fall to decline a flattering call to another field, in order to work out his plan, and the church has installed an assistant pastor with a view to fostering its branch organizations and the neighboring churches, which had been neglected and have now come under its care.

Meanwhile the Vermont Home Missionary Society is developing another branch of ministerial labor by employing women as evangelists in country districts. Their house-to-house visits have everywhere been cordially welcomed, and they have thus gathered audiences which have greatly surprised pastors of neighboring churches who have been called to preach to them. In one place, where the church had long been closed, it was reopened after personal visits by two of these women, with an audience four times larger than had ever been seen within its walls. In other communities, where spiritualism had prevailed, and where few Christians could be found, the places of public meeting have been filled with attentive listeners. Pastors in the neighborhood of whose parishes this work has been done have without exception expressed their approval of it. One writes of the women: "They have shown what young ladies with the spirit of consecration are and can do. They have won all hearts." Another says: "The truth was presented by them so intelligently and clearly, and their manner of approaching people was so judicious and kindly, as to heighten immensely the respect of the community, even the irreligious part of it, for Christian work and workers." Superintendent Merrill says: "To many their story has been a revelation of a new and hitherto untried method and agency in Christian work."

This question of expanding the territory and influence of the local church is attracting much more attention in England than in this country. Bitter complaints are made there of the multiplication of small churches, of the inability to support them, especially in the decaying agricultural districts, and of the miserable pittance on which many ministers with families are compelled to subsist. The London "Independent" not long ago printed several columns of letters from ministers and laymen, urging that these churches should be so grouped together as to form adequate fields of labor with adequate salaries. The bane

of the Congregational denomination was declared to be the excessive number of chapels, each with a separate minister, and the remedy urged was the grouping of from two to four under one pastor with one or more helpers. Many instances were given where two or more Congregational churches stand near enough together so that one of them could easily provide for all the needs of both.

It is worth noting that the same subject is exciting much interest also in the Established Church. One rector says: "The country vicar is terribly alone in his work. Unless he has deep spirituality and great force of character, his enthusiasm will evaporate in face of the stolid indifference of a large section of his parishioners. Of all classes in the community, the small farmer and the agricultural laborer are the least easy to move." Another writes of "the accumulated body of social tradition grotesquely mixing itself up in sacred things, . . . which is quite beyond the power of the country clergy to remove by any special remedy under existing circumstances;" meaning single-handed and alone.

Instances are altogether too common in our own country where churches of the same denomination have separated and built edifices almost side by side, through some petty quarrel, which has been perpetuated at great waste for a generation or more. At the recent Ecumenical Council in Washington a delegate made a statement which is worthy to pass into a proverb, and fits any denomination. He said: "Where two rival Methodist churches meet in a village, there is no need for the devil."

England furnishes already several examples of Congregational churches with more than one pastor and place of worship. For example, at Great Yarmouth one such church has two houses and two ministers who have worked in harmony for several years. At Wellingborough two churches united several years ago, but maintained separate meeting-places. The present pastor, Rev. T. Stephens, with lay helpers, superintends services in six places, all of which are included in one church organization.

The idea we are considering is certainly not a new one in England, since it is fully explained and commended in Dr. Davidson's Congregational lectures, delivered forty years ago. He says: "It is usually a hazardous experiment (as perilous to religion as it is contrary to the tenor of the New Testament) to split up what would be a single church into small societies, each independent of the other." The fact must not be overlooked that he is speaking of Congregational churches, and that he keeps in view the idea of

the self-government and independence of the local church, though its members may have several places of meeting. He defends this idea by saying : —

“ Nothing seems more certain than that there was in *each* primitive church a plurality of presbyters. The fact is admitted by the ablest historians. The advantages of a plurality are obvious : (1.) The people are better instructed. No one minister excels in *all* the duties of the eldership ; there is, therefore, the greatest wisdom in employing several men in the ministerial work. (2.) Pastoral visitation is better attended to. The chief part of the ministry is not the preaching of a sermon on the Sabbath, but the performance of numerous duties in watching over the flock. Where a church is large, *one* pastor has not sufficient time for this. (3.) The unsettledness of the pastoral office is materially lessened. The number of removals made by ministers of religion are fewer. The demands made by a church on a sole pastor are too great. When there is a plurality of ministers, variety is secured, and yet no man is overtasked. Hence the pastors do not become migratory.”

But the discussion in England does not stop with the idea of consolidating two or more Congregational churches into one. The “ Christian World ” takes as its motto “ One Town, One Church,” and proposes that at least Baptist and Congregational churches in the same town, both being Congregationally governed, be federated, with different buildings, but a united membership ; and this proposal is heartily supported by some of the foremost leaders of Congregationalism. This is more feasible in English than in American communities, because the majority of Baptists there do not practice close communion. The proposition leaves those who believe in immersion free to continue it, and to maintain, if they choose, a separate congregation, while those who prefer sprinkling and infant baptism, are left equally free ; but both would support one pastor, with one or more assistants, if needed.

English Congregational pastors present very effective arguments for this plan, of which there is only space to quote two or three extracts. Dr. A. Goodrich, of Manchester, says : —

“ One district, one church, would, I think, save our smaller churches. Our village churches have done, and are doing, noble service ; but in the changes that are slowly and surely coming over us they will not survive ; their extinction will mean the larger churches becoming smaller churches, which, in due time, will follow their extinct sisters. Salvation for our smaller churches surely must come from the plan here indicated. Many of our laymen are saying that our system is too costly. It certainly is in a sense other than they mean ; it is in our

smaller churches crushing the best life out of our best men. The unification of the churches in a district will save our men as well as our means. Or rather it will so dispose our means that our business men, able and willing to give, will say, 'This means business, and we will support it.' Has not the hour come for some such movement? We as churches have now for some time been contending for liberty of thought. I think we have got it. Then let us draw together and go forward."

Rev. G. S. Barrett, of Norwich, after pointing out the jealousies and differences which are apt to arise in small and divided churches from the littleness of view which is thus fostered, adds:—

"With one large, commanding, and vigorous church in each city or town, this evil would at least be largely neutralized, if not rendered impossible altogether. The freer air, the wider outlook, the more catholic spirit, which come from larger affairs, would insensibly affect the churches themselves, and instead of any departure from the traditions of the fathers being resented as a wanton innovation, it would be judged and tested solely by its adequacy to fulfill the truest and noblest ideal of our Congregational church life, and by its accordance, or otherwise, with the spirit and teaching of the New Testament."

Rev. Dr. Alexander Mackennal says:—

"The general idea, 'One Town, one Church,' has been before my mind as a vision ever since I was at college in the fifties; and I am glad to see signs of its being taken up as a practical question. I am sure it is practicable. If not immediately so, the discussion of it will educate the constituency that will make it so. In these days, when youth is doing so much of the world's work, we ought not to say of an ideal, it cannot be adopted. In ten or fifteen years the generation is fashioned that will give effective form to any desirable idea."

These sentiments are by no means confined to a few. The subject of which they treat is occupying large and increasing attention, and is regarded as offering a possible solution of one of the most difficult and threatening problems of English church life.

The conditions which are forcing this matter upon public attention there are steadily and surely developing in this country. They would, perhaps, be receiving more consideration if the changes they require did not interfere with plans for evangelization which are being earnestly, and perhaps not altogether wisely, pressed. The impression seems to be quite general that there is a dearth of ministers, and that abundant fields, offering comfortable support, are waiting for laborers. At least three schools in and about Boston are offering short cuts to the ministry, or courses of



training for professional service, and several similar institutions have recently sprung up in different parts of the country, all making urgent appeals for money, on the ground that so great is the dearth of laborers for ripe and ungathered harvests, that there is no time to give adequate training to those who are willing to rush in and reap.

What are the facts? It would seem reasonable that the average minister should be expected to be able to care for the spiritual welfare of one hundred and fifty persons, and to lead them in their efforts to win to Christ those outside of the churches. But if every Congregational minister were in active service, we should have one for every one hundred and ten members; and if the ministers now actually in pastoral office were equally distributed, there would be one for every one hundred and thirty-seven resident members. The average resident membership of Congregational churches in the United States is about ninety. If every church must have the entire service of one minister of such qualifications as to bring him a unanimous call, then we need more ministers. But even under present conditions it would not be difficult to man every Congregational pulpit whose church could support a pastor. Meanwhile there are hundreds of towns, not growing in population, where three or more evangelical churches have each a minister, while all the congregations together would not fill one of the churches. It may as well be frankly said, that while the Lord of the harvest calls for more laborers, He does not so much need more salaried officers as a wiser distribution of those already in the field. A church in eastern Massachusetts, without a pastor, has recently received over one hundred applications from ministers, or from others in their behalf, for the privilege of supplying the pulpit. It is safe to say that if fifty vacancies should suddenly occur in churches about Boston the middle of this week, men could easily be found to preach for them all before Sunday. There are in this vicinity a number of able and in every way worthy ministers, whose ambition is not unreasonable, who have spent many months, and in some instances years, of weary waiting, who have so far failed to find pastorates where they can support their families.

The simple fact is, that, looked at from any reasonable business point of view, the ministerial profession at home is numerically overstocked. The only real call for ministers which deserves at present to be heeded is from mission-fields. The special calls of God to individuals we do not gainsay, but the call from home



churches arises from the fact that more than two fifths of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches in the United States have less than fifty members each, while each wants a minister for itself alone. Though the statistics of Baptist churches are not at hand, I have no doubt the same is true of that denomination. Methodism, with its system of circuit-riding and local preachers, is able to supply all its churches, while more of its ministers annually leap over from its fold into Congregational pastures than from all other denominations together.

The only remedy so far suggested for this unbusinesslike administration of religious affairs, alike wasteful of men and money, is the one discussed in the article already referred to in the "Andover Review," and now under consideration in religious papers and meetings in England. That it has serious difficulties no one denies. But that the continuance of present conditions involves far greater difficulties is at least an open question; and it is possible that men, and women even, burdened with the imperfections of human nature not yet wholly sanctified, may be made to see and choose the better way. Every experiment like that at Newport, successfully carried out, will stand as a powerful argument. If churches whose members agree in all essentials of belief and administration can be so far united as to offer adequate opportunities and adequate support to able ministers, a victory for the gospel will be achieved greater than the evangelization of a heathen nation.

So far in this discussion we have had in view the advantages to be gained from this plan for country churches. But its results would not be less effective were it to be applied to cities. Perhaps this can best be demonstrated by a concrete illustration. Dr C. H. Parkhurst, pastor of the Madison Square Presbyterian Church in New York, a year ago found a family on the East Side of the city in need of help. He introduced to them a family of his own church. The results so far proved promising that, when he described his efforts in the "Congregationalist" for May 7, 1891, he had brought twenty families of his people in some measure into touch with twenty other families on the East Side. The first anniversary of the enterprise a few weeks ago found them established in a well-equipped church house. No doubt that is the way revealed by God to spread the leaven of Christianity through the world. It was the plan which Christ himself adopted. If the wisdom, love, and devotion in that church are equal to the task, it will fulfill its mission.

But let us suppose this plan to be followed out to its natural results, and see what this movement involves. The twenty families on the East Side being kindled with the spirit of Christ and his impulses of love to men, have come together in some kind of organization. But they cannot at once cut loose from the church which planted the new life there. They need still the sympathy and fellowship which they have had. They need financial aid, counsel, and encouragement to find pastoral leadership, and to extend their work. They will probably increase mainly through a Sunday-school, studying the Bible together, getting the gospel into other homes through the children; and they will need teachers and leaders from the other church. Quite likely at first the enterprise will not require large expenditure of money. A wise and devoted woman perhaps can guide it to the larger growth which requires the ministrations of a pastor. We have quite an army of such women in foreign fields. We ought to have more of them in home fields, like Phebe and Priscilla and Mary, deaconesses whom Paul so lovingly commended to the church at Rome.

Further, the Madison Square church will need to continue its interest in the work which has become a part of itself. Its own life will deepen through its labors there, and it will be moved to start other enterprises in the dense mass of heathenism, which, close at hand, outnumbers all the adherents of Protestant churches. But the pastor cannot preach often in these new Christian communities, whose prosperity depends on their union with the mother-church. The deaconesses cannot continue to meet their growing wants. The pastor must have an assistant, and if his church prospers sufficiently in its work, more than one. For its success will depend on its pressing continually into new and needy fields. If it does not, it will settle gradually down into contentment with worship at home, and self-cultivation, without aggressive effort, and will go to seed, as so many churches have done. As business encroaches on its territory, its members will move out, and it will become a dead, down-town church.

It cannot expect, either, to gain sufficient support by establishing branches among the poorer classes only. Suppose, then, it sends out one or more plants into prosperous neighborhoods up-town, and they flourish as such organizations are apt to do, — would do far oftener, if Christians who lived in those neighborhoods would cast in their lot with the new enterprises. For one thing which makes against the prosperity of city churches is that many

of their members live too far away to attend the prayer-meetings and Sunday-schools, and keep up organic life, while yet they are held to retain their pews and attend public worship, in order to sustain the down-town church. It was lately found that in Roxbury, a district of Boston, 1,575 of our church members go past the churches near their homes, to worship three or four miles away. Now if these members had found in their own communities branches of the down-town church, with one chief pastor, and assistants for the various localities, the parent church would retain its prestige, the stronger and weaker parts would combine for the support of the whole, courage and active effort would continue, and masses of heathenism could not flourish undisturbed.

Dr. Schauffler, in figures which have been widely quoted, has shown that in the last twenty years in New York, Presbyterian church members increased from 18,773 to 23,430, while Methodists have hardly held their own at 12,000, and Episcopalians have gained from 19,672 to 36,135. In the latter case, by far the greater part of the gain in their seventy-five churches was in the twenty-two which had more than one minister for each church. Can we not learn from such a showing, how to invest men and money so as to get larger returns than we are getting? Can we not find a way better to distribute our ministers so as to bring Christians more directly into personal contact with those outside the churches?

To meet changed conditions of society created by the rapid increase of city population and its decrease in the country, we do not need to invent methods altogether new. We are already trying, here and there, consolidation of churches, in a disorderly sort of way, hardly recognizing the fact. We have already the orders in the ministry which have here been suggested. To pastors we have joined associate and assistant pastors, pastors' assistants, women missionaries, deaconesses, and lay helpers. We are feeling our way to meet these changed conditions as the zeal and genius of one and another pastor lead them to make experiments. But has not the time arrived for us to deduce some new principles from these occasional enterprises which will help to bring the whole body more to the front in meeting the needs of our times? I venture to state the following conclusions from this discussion as reasonable and practicable:—

1. Every church should make it its business to see that the invitation of the gospel is effectively given to every person within its parish, and that it is given through the active and continued interest of one person in another.

2. The aim should be to have as many centres for worship and work as may be needed in each parish, but with one building in which all on occasion may gather; and as many local organizations as may be necessary to cover the entire field, with one church for all of the same denomination.

3. The organization aimed at should have one pastor for the whole church, with as many assistants as the field requires and as the financial condition of the church will allow.

4. Each local body may administer its own local affairs; but the whole church should choose the pastor, his assistants and church officers, and should decide on the basis of belief and the general plans of work. The extent of the field to be occupied should be determined by its need and by the ability of the church to work it.

The objections to this plan are by no means without weight. I have space only to name some of them. It involves innovations on the traditions of Congregationalism. But I think we have shown that they are not altogether new. At any rate, modern life is making swift and tremendous inroads on the traditions of society. Our denominational traditions are not the only things we need to preserve. Men do not win in these times, either in the business of the world or of God, without taking risks, without boldness as well as wisdom. Let us glorify traditions in their time and place. Let us make new ones worthy of our generation. A wise and courageous application of the principles of Congregationalism will meet the need of to-day.

This plan might trench on the independence of the local church. No doubt there are those who would rather be in a little company than in a large one. They are likely to have more authority, and they regard that as independence. There are, especially in the country districts, hard-headed, not especially warm-hearted men and women who are not at all troubled by dependence on outside helpers to furnish money for their church, if they are only allowed to use it without interference. They would rather be independent than to win the community to Christ. This is an objection easy to answer in theory but most difficult in practice.

This plan might jeopardize the independence of the minister. A considerable number would have to be associate or assistant pastors. Most men prefer to be supreme in their own fields, and to work out their own results. But such independence may cost too much. The man who aims to do the largest service for Christ and humanity is not to be blamed if he hesitates to commit his

life to an organization with such limitations as are to be found in many country churches. He would quite likely value such so-called independence less than the larger opportunity.

Finally, then, has not the time come when it is imperative to discuss such changes in our church organization as will lead to expanding the local church, with a single head and a single centre of meeting, but with helpers and branches sufficient to lead and guide society in its changed conditions? Why should its inventions, appliances, enterprise, and spirit outstrip those of the churches? We are a part of society, and we are also members of Christ. We honor traditions, but we do not spend our lives for them. We live and labor that we may bring all men into the likeness of Christ.

*A. E. Dunning.*

BOSTON.

---

#### MISSIONARY PROBLEMS IN THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

AMONG the missions of the American Board, those established in Turkey are in some respects the most important. Some may, indeed, deny them to be missions at all, and maintain them to be merely proselytizing enterprises, inasmuch as their activity is mainly directed upon populations of Turkey that are Christian already, — the Armenians, the Greeks, and the Bulgarians. Undoubtedly the sacred name of mission is presumptively inapplicable to operations among our fellow-Christians, among those who believe exactly as we concerning God and Christ, and substantially as we concerning the nature of Christian holiness and Christian morality. But it must be borne in mind that the American missions in Turkey have always had and still have ultimately in view the evangelization of the Mohammedans themselves. As the officers of the Board declare, the last thing they purpose is the mere propagation of Protestantism in Turkey. Indeed, there are already various regions of Asia Minor where the Protestants and the members of the Armenian Church, or Gregorians, are on terms of cordiality, and, now and then, hold services together. The members and officers of the Board leave it to divine Providence to determine whether Protestantism shall continue to act upon the elder churches, but especially the Armenian Church, as an influence from without, or shall be hospitably reabsorbed, and

act more powerfully as a quickening leaven from within, or whether, as has been suggested by at least one writer in the "Missionary Herald" (Mr. William Chambers, of Erzurum), the Episcopalians may not find a mediating function whereby the historic continuity of this eldest of national churches may be conciliated with the higher evangelical apprehensions of the Reformation. It is enough that the American Missions in Turkey (including those in Syria and Egypt, of which we are not now speaking) are an admitted and powerful influence for spiritual, moral, and intellectual advance, and are already beginning to overflow from the Christian populations upon the adherents of Islam. Their value has found witnesses abroad as widely divergent in character as the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Earl of Beaconsfield, both of whom recognize that their entire freedom from all suspicion of political aims gives them a force for good which cannot be exerted by many European missionaries in the Ottoman Empire.

The great danger with successful missions is that the missionaries may continue to hold their people too long in tutelage, instead of admitting them more and more to self-control as they become fitter for it, or that they may urge upon them specialties of opinion or usage which are indifferent to the essential end. The very essence of Romanism, as distinguished from the legitimate existence of a Catholicism under the presidency of Rome, is, as Clement XIV. is said to have told the Conclave before he left it as Pope, that Rome, like so many mothers, finds it hard to know when her children are grown. And as American Protestants have exactly the same human nature as Roman Curialists, the American Board has done well to encourage one distinct step forward towards native autonomy, especially in Western Turkey, the measure having already, after trial, secured the cordial approbation of the missionaries. So far as the means of support, however, still come from America, the right of final revision will no doubt yet be claimed by the givers. The Americans and the Armenians, it is true, do not yet view this matter from the same angle of vision. But only in Eastern Turkey have we discovered evidence of bitterness, and there it is chiefly entertained towards persons that have long been out of connection with the Board.

The following questions, which partly respect this matter of growing self-direction, but are mostly of a more general character, have been addressed to a number of missionaries in Turkey, or that have been in Turkey, and also to various native brethren,

after having been first submitted to the foreign secretaries of the Board and approved by them. Indeed, the last two are of their suggestion. We give the main points of reply. The questions, although not drawn up without the help of local experience, are necessarily somewhat vague, as being addressed to laborers dwelling all the way from the Euphrates to the Bosphorus. But it is hoped that as tentative they will be found not unprofitable. It was our original intention to give the answers to each question *seriatim*. We find, however, that many of them run into one another in such a way as to make this difficult to do. And besides, the necessity of averaging the results of inquiry in the three missions of Asia Minor interferes with articulated precision, which, moreover, is not likely to be very much insisted on by our American readers, who desire not so much the lights and shades of particular regions or letters as the combined impression left by a careful and repeated reading of some thirty-eight or forty replies from different parts of Asiatic Turkey, as well as from Constantinople, and from Armenians and missionaries or former missionaries now in the United States.

As Mr. Dwight, of Constantinople, has lately remarked in the "Independent," letters from missionaries are like reports from a battlefield. Each man sees only his own part of the plain, and, in the dust (we can no longer say in the smoke) of the turmoil, hardly sees that. There is no perspective, for this can be gained only by a long and toilsome process of sifting and comparison. Where the battlefield is a whole empire, and the battle is carried on by three or four distinct armies, united only in a distant war office, redaction may well be delayed, and be content at last with very imperfect results. Our correspondence dates from one to two years back, and must be interpreted in the light of the fact that during the last year the Protestant churches of Turkey have received unusually large accessions; the circulation of Christian literature has been increasingly wide; and the native contributions, in the midst of growing poverty, have been larger than ever before. The government has remained unfriendly, but not acutely so, and Mr. Hirsch, our minister at Constantinople, has continued his excellent predecessor's policy of judicious but energetic intervention where international rights had been really invaded.

It is very evident that nothing like a stable equilibrium in missionary matters has been reached in Asia Minor. When the Mohammedans, who form the vast majority, shall begin to accept



the gospel (as Wilfrid Blunt, who knows them so well, holds it to be highly probable that in Turkey and Tartary they will, within a measurable time), the present balance will be entirely shifted. In view of that chiefly, there must not be a hasty withdrawal of Americans, as the Moslems will listen to them with a respect which they are far from entertaining towards the races subject to themselves.

At present, however, we have only to consider the Christian populations of Asia Minor, chiefly the Armenians. The influences which are acting upon them through the missionaries are by no means harmonious. It is not to be desired at first that they should be. They have been reposing unto death for ages. As an English writer has intimated, the eagerness, abruptness, self-sufficiency, and Puritan narrowness of the Yankee character have been just what was needed to break up Oriental slumbers and loose the chains of immemorial habit. Tholuck, among his droll questions, used sometimes to ask his American pupils why God had made so many Chinamen and so few New Englanders. A pertinent answer might well have been: "To save mankind from being reformed quite to pieces." We owe more thanks than we are likely to pay to the solid wall of Dutch and German burgherdom, extending from Schenectady to Delaware, for its services in breaking somewhat the impetuous and intolerant force of New England ideas in our own country. But in Turkey they are not likely to become strong enough to oppress, and will long be useful to rouse. Even the naive indecency with which some of the missionaries, especially the ladies, confine the name of "Christian" to Protestants, has its use in promoting concentration of zeal. And, after all, American religious self-complacency is but a crust over a hearty brotherliness and friendliness which is easily conciliated by anything like corresponding cordiality, not to speak of the many missionaries whose zeal has not needed to be reinforced by bigotry.

Nevertheless it is evidently time that Protestant missions should pass into their second stage. The virgin zeal of the churches for the evangelization of the world inevitably involved an exaggerated idealization of the missionaries. That was less excessive at first, when the hardships and dangers were so great, and the alluring motives, except in the love of Christ and of men, so few. And even yet the missionary life cuts off most ambitions, and eminently favors singleness of aim. The general average of missionary devotedness, whether on our own frontier or in the world



at large, may reasonably be held to be higher than the average of the home pastorate. Yet, seeing that with every year the heathen and Moslem world is becoming more and more a dependent suburb of Christendom, it is absurd to treat the missionary body as if the higher degrees of heroism and saintly consecration would now be alone adequate to induce to a missionary life. Indeed, at no time can Adoniram Judsons have been numerous, with such a union of devotion and intellectual eminence. The body of missionaries, male and female, are, like their brethren and sisters of similar vocation at home, sincere Christians, with a standard of service much more distinctly and invariably held up before them, but depressed in their efforts towards it by a sufficiently large alloy of human imperfection in its various forms of timorousness, indolence, self-seeking, fractiousness, haughtiness, imperiousness, and narrowness. And as the missionary life in some ways weakens these faults, in some others it may aggravate them, especially through its freedom from the sharp oversight of surrounding society, replaced by the presence of converts at once grateful and timid, hardly willing, or hardly daring, to sit in judgment on those to whom they owe so much. Their language, as in the mediæval myth, is: *Judica teipsum, sancte pater, nos enim judicare te non possumus*. The era of pungent criticism of ways and men has begun in England, and must begin in America. It will be crude and harsh at first, but it will settle into the mean of reasonable appreciation and requirement at last.

It is honorable to the American missions in Turkey that, while the letters from the native brethren have been guarded by a pledge of entire privacy (a sort of *sigillum confessionis*), it is only those which respect Eastern Turkey that express dislike and distrust of the missionaries, but principally of some who are not now controllable by the Board, while some who are in its service are expressly exempted from these censures. There seems to have been some root of bitterness early planted in this mission; for letters received from native Protestants who offer to produce explicit testimonies of their own credibility make charges of bigoted obscurantism, desirous of keeping the education of the native assistants down to the lowest pitch; angrily opposing, and indeed forbidding, the study of English, at least formerly; trying to secure preachers of a very low grade of qualifications, for the sake of having the most men for the least money; paying them so little that one minister now in this country, who was for a while an inspector of the stations, declares it was much if a native pastor

could set before him even the simplest lunch, or if the pastor and his family had more than one tumble-down room to live in. They charge certain missionaries, in the face of this meagre provision for the native workers, with luxurious self-indulgence; with a whimsical despotism that would shift or dismiss natives on the slightest occasion or cause of offense; and with such haughtiness that a young American minister is said to have gone through an association meeting of several days without having once condescended to notice a single one of the Armenian pastors, and without appearing to have received any rebuke from his foreign brethren by this superciliousness. They say that, while those pastors who possibly can are expected to give handsome entertainment for days together to missionaries and their families on their rounds, it is a thing almost unheard of for an Armenian minister to be asked to sit at a missionary's table. The force of these accusations, however, against the principal offenders, who are designated by name in letters written in this country, but for whom no American authority is now answerable, is considerably reduced by the declaration that their conduct is too eccentric to be compatible with soundness of mind. And several missionaries of the Board have been acknowledged as men of altogether a different tone, and only so far involved in these faults as the faults have become an inveterate evil of this mission. One Armenian preacher from Eastern Turkey, writing in this country, declares that he and fifteen college graduates, twelve being licensed preachers, have been driven, by sheer impossibility of living on the wages offered them at home, to work in American factories at \$1.20 a day.

From the other two missions not a breath of anything approaching to these charges has been heard. The only accusations made here are that the missionaries, in their disgust at the reverence accorded to the mere office of priest in the old church, have unguardedly used language which is now proving seriously detrimental to the standing of the Protestant ministers among their own countrymen; that after the joint boards of Americans and Armenians have sanctioned outlays for the stations, a veto, only too readily used, rests with the foreigners, or even with one of them; and that the Unions of native brethren are not held worthy of direct correspondence with the Board. The spirit and purpose both of the Board and the missionaries are warmly declared to be excellent, but their policy is believed, now that there is so large a body of approved and cultivated helpers, to be lagging in arrear

of the just claims of equality and coöperation. These friendly criticisms proceed especially from the Armenian brethren at Aintab, Krikorian, Markarian, Bezjian, and Levonian, who expressly absolve us from the obligation of suppressing their names, as, indeed, their temperate remarks require no concealment. Their carefully prepared joint letter deserves separate publication.

There is a frequent expression, in the letters from all three missions, of the opinion that the Board, in steadily reducing appropriations notwithstanding the steadily deepening poverty of the country, has proceeded too mechanically. The people, they say, are able to do less, and, the missions also doing less, the native pastors are sorely straitened. On the other hand, the missionaries not unreasonably remark that the contact with Americans, naturally enough but rather unhappily, often excites in the native helpers wants too far in advance of the general standard of living among their countrymen to make it desirable that they should be met. The missionaries declare with one voice that the incomes of the pastors bear substantially the same proportion to the average incomes of their people as those of American pastors. The Armenians, it must be borne in mind, are great merchants in the regions from Vienna to Calcutta, and this keen susceptibility to gain, while it quickens their energy, is apt to lessen their reliability as evangelical workers. At the same time some of the native brethren (here again from Eastern Turkey) declare that the Roman Catholics develop native force much more fully, and give their clergy (and indeed their laity) a better education and their clergy a better support. In Central (and perhaps in Western) Turkey, the missionaries affirm that great restlessness and discontent are induced by those who come to America and return after securing from private donors a support two or three or even four times as large as the same men could possibly have secured at home. They remark that Americans show themselves rather credulous here. Being accustomed to connect religion and conduct more strictly than the Orientals do, they draw inferences from fluent and earnest devoutness as to advancement of Christian character which they might not always do if they had lived in the East, and do not hesitate to throw things into confusion there for the sake of gratifying their benevolent sympathies, and perhaps also their pride of patronage here. The missionaries mention two or three gentlemen, worthy and useful, whose disproportionate affluence, however, from private liberality, they think lifts them undesirably above the level of their ministerial

countrymen. Private petting, they think, is a very ambiguous good in any connected system of missionary work.

All the correspondents, American and Armenian, urge that special donations should be made from America for the establishment of pastoral libraries at the stations. It is quite impossible for the pastors to buy books enough to keep themselves up to the due level. They are paid at Turkish rates, but must buy books at American rates. Station libraries, however, would meet the want for all that large percentage of the helpers who read English. Those that have not learned it enough to read it are seldom those for whom libraries are especially important. Moreover, the stock of Christian literature in the Asiatic vernaculars is, if not rapidly, yet steadily growing. But all the correspondents protest against being burdened with the leavings of home libraries, or with the productions of the platitudinarians. It is best to send moneys for this designated purpose, and to let those who are to use the books decide what books they will buy. The Board is naturally the best intermediary here.

Here, too, remark several of the correspondents, there would be a great lift in the intellectual standard of the four missions (Mardin, as speaking Arabic, being practically distinct), if in each there could be every year a two weeks' Chautauqua Assembly, with the stereopticon, and all the various mechanical and pictorial appliances, supported by home study. Traveling in these wide regions, however, is toilsome, dangerous, and expensive. There are still those many "perils of waters," and "perils of robbers," and perils of impracticable ways, which St. Paul found of old in these same regions. The salaries of the pastors and teachers would be quite inadequate to compass this result, stimulating for every good end of society and culture, intellectual and religious, as it would be. Here again is suggested a worthy use of money for those Christians who love giving for definite objects.

The native brethren evidently think there are too many Americans in the field, doing less work for more money than if their members were reduced to such as are required for the higher teaching, and the few more whose episcopal and evangelistic gifts are of approved eminence. Some suggest that the missionaries agglomerate themselves too much in a few stations, an instinct of human sociability which used to vex the soul of Adoniram Judson, but which it is plain that the apostles did not view so severely, to judge by their practice. Here, however, say the native brethren, is the place where retrenchment, if imperative,

ought to begin, since everywhere else retrenchment is impossible without inducing impotency.

The native brethren, moreover, criticise very decidedly the policy of opening so many village stations. They would have the missionaries, like the apostles, concentrate labor on the cities, and leave these to radiate abroad a higher influence upon the country districts. Then, too, fewer men could strike heavier blows. Some say outright that the missionaries have been too eager to send home a long beadrill of names, many of which signify little. It is allowed on both sides, that evangelistic labor must be mainly in native hands. The question is as to supervision. The Americans insist that most of the native helpers are not sufficiently developed either in intellect or character to walk alone, so that, indeed, they feel uneasy without having a missionary to whom they may be accountable. The Armenians, of every grade, seem to recognize no such necessity. They hold themselves to be an adult race, and to be in no need of being treated as children.

Those churches in California that have a good many Armenian members have a tough time in working along. The Armenians are by no means intellectually equal to the Jews (as few races are), but they are quite equal to them in heady impracticability. They will have things their own way, or they will block the wheels. It is nothing to them that Americans, in America, may reasonably claim to have American habits of action observed. It seems pretty plain that in the long run the two races must work apart, and that in Turkey the natives, whether Armenian or Greek, must have their own matters in their own hands, American donors contenting themselves with occasional deputations to learn whether their gifts are efficiently applied. If most of the helpers rose to the Aintab level, there would be less friction. But most will not, and those that do will be better supervisors of their countrymen than foreigners, a very few excepted. At present the missions in Turkey are too much like that two-headed tortoise described in the "St. Nicholas." One head may be the wiser, but the other is the more willful, and between the two the body decidedly halts in its going.

In one point the missionaries appear decidedly unreasonable. A good many not only oppose the resort of Armenian students of theology to American seminaries, but even refuse testimonials to them, and treat their going as little short of a criminal offense. This is plainly inequitable. They may urge that most of these have been helped out of mission funds. But the young men have

not been received as Redemptioners, as Nethinim, or *adscripti ecclesie*. They have retained their rights of free action and free movement, and are plainly entitled to testimonials of their actual standing, unless the missionaries are prepared, like the Brahmins, to treat crossing the sea as involving a forfeiture of caste. Armenians sometimes say, "Why am I bound to stay in Turkey to starve, or to return to Turkey to be browbeaten as a criminal? They intimate that they do not much relish hearing somewhat imperious exhortations to self-denial from those whose own privations are so much less. Doubtless, as the missionaries say, those men who, having equal abilities to command a support abroad, or in secular business at home, take up with the hard lot of a native evangelist, give peculiar proof of an apostolic mind. But it is urged that this, to be worthy, must be a free choice, and not something bound on a man by the angry command of a foreign superior. Various students, we remark, have been self-supported throughout, and are acknowledged by the missionaries to owe no account of their doings to them.

It is evident that the Central Turkey Mission has done strenuous work in raising the intellectual level of the Armenians, ministry and laity. Out of the original school, half academy, half college, and half seminary (to use the Mississippi boatman's arithmetic), there were developed in about ten years a higher and a lower school, the former retaining a duplex character, from which, in about fifteen years more, were evolved the Central Turkey College at Aintab and the Theological Seminary at Marash. The percentage of ministers who have taken a full academic course has grown with the opportunities, until now it includes almost all the newer students. The theological course is of three years, and includes Hebrew, Greek, Systematic Theology, Biblical Theology, Homiletics, Vocal Music, with abundant practice in preaching and the conduct of prayer-meetings. Biblical Theology, gratefully acknowledged as a transplantation from Andover and from Professor Hincks's lecture-room, seems to have taken a peculiarly deep root in the affections of the young men. And, indeed, what the Bible teaches does seem to be of more importance than what divines teach about the Bible. The number of students, however, whether at Marash, Marsovan, or Harpoot, in the centre, the west, or the east, must gradually decline to a minimum as those stations come to be filled which alone can reasonably lay claim to the services of regularly educated pastors. The number of principal stations, remarks a missionary, must soon reach its limit.



Thenceforward, he declares, it will be an unjustifiable redundancy of men and means to maintain three theological schools in Asia Minor. With this seems to agree the weighty judgment of Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, who advises us of his decided belief that in ten years' time there ought to be a central seminary set up in Constantinople, and that there ought to be no thought of one earlier.

This question, Number Five, is answered negatively by almost all. A few, however, and those names of weight, are for a central seminary, provided it can be developed out of that now at Marash, and transferred, perhaps, to Cæsarea, that it may be actually central for the great peninsula. Yet one of the missionaries, and one of the most eminent, is very emphatic in affirming the necessity of soon establishing a central seminary in Constantinople. He says that the missionaries, as a general body, have no doubt about it; but so soon as they are segregated again into their separate missions, local feeling carries the day. He holds that a seminary at Constantinople, thoroughly maintained and manned, and absorbing the three divinity schools of Asia Minor, would largely draw the minds of the more promising students away from the thought of crossing the sea. He agrees with a leading clergyman of Constantinople, that there is something childish in urging the dangers to the moral and spiritual life in Constantinople, unless we would urge that it is dangerous for young men to study divinity in New York. Young men of the standing of those who alone ought to be encouraged to repair to Constantinople would be all the better of the atmosphere and grand opportunities of this great capital, and could be depended on to return to such churches as could promise them a reasonable support. Young men of inferior standing could be sufficiently trained in a theological annex to each of the colleges.

The missionary who is most urgent for the speedy establishment of the Constantinople seminary calls attention to the absurd results of a comparison with this country. There is now actually one seminary for every twenty-three churches. If the Congregationalists of America were equally profuse, instead of seven seminaries, as now, they would have one hundred and ninety-eight. If they rated by members instead of churches, they would need three hundred and fifteen. Even counting out-stations, each of the Turkish seminaries only serves about sixty churches, less than one tenth of the home rate. It is plain that we cannot expect great results on such a scale.

On the other hand, Miss Mary P. Wright remarks that practi-



cally, rather in time than in distance, Harpoot is much farther from Constantinople than Boston from San Francisco, while the differences in the scale of living and the varieties of usage are greater than between a mining camp of the Rocky Mountains and the most refined culture of the East. Then, while Mardin uses Arabic, and some regions of Asia Minor Armenian, others use only Turkish, so that students who might manage to blunder through the jargon of business would be all at sea in the language of literature or refined conversation. Those, however, who are for the central seminary say, "Let the language of instruction in it be English, as it is in Robert College." It seems plain that it must be that, and equally plain, as Dr. Hamlin says, that the only question is, How soon shall the central seminary be set up, and that in Constantinople? Whenever it is established, it is plain that the three Asiatic divinity schools must be content to subside into simple, shorter-course affairs. As to proposing Cæsarea as a substitute for Constantinople, it is no more practicable than in Italy to propose Bologna for the capital as a substitute for Rome, which would please the Pope but nobody else. Cæsarea might be a geographical, but it would not be a national, social, or intellectual centre.

Marsovan, in Western Asia Minor, has Greek as well as Armenian students. This again brings up the question of language. The seminary can hardly be double-tongued in instruction; and if the Greeks, who are increasing in relative importance, are to be on an equality, the language of the class-room ought to be English. As an eminent member of the West Turkey Mission says, the question of a central seminary is like Banquo's ghost, it will not down.

We note some statistical replies. One letter says that in Eastern Turkey one half of the theological graduates enter the ministry, and one half of these continue in it. But a missionary letter says that, of one hundred and two graduates, *all* have entered the work, and more than one half are still in it. In Western Turkey all have entered the work, and two thirds are still in it. The same proportions, substantially, prevail in Central Turkey. In Eastern Turkey a letter gives \$616 as received from the Board, \$2,561 as raised by the people, within the year. In Central Turkey about three eighths is stated as received from the Board. In Western Turkey, of eight churches in one district, one is self-supporting, two nearly or quite half so. In Eastern Turkey few churches are vacant, and fourteen have ordained pastors. In

Central Turkey, of thirty-three churches, twenty-two are without regular pastors. There are twenty-two ordained natives in the mission.

Students of theology have usually enough given them by the mission to cover at least their board. If they are married, the amount is proportionately increased.

The answer to the question, What inducements can be offered to bring a larger number of the college graduates to enter the ministry, is, A greater spirit of consecration. It is maintained that at present there are as many motives for them to enter the ministry as for our young men at home, and that it is doubtful whether any additional attractions, except through the force of the highest motives, can be offered to them. It is maintained by the missionaries (but denied by some of the native brethren) that they are as well able to give all their time to their work as ministers in our country.

The teachers in the theological seminaries, it is replied to the thirteenth question, might well be relieved, for the most part, from pastoral and evangelistic responsibilities. Some suggest that it would be well to have a few men devoted to the translation of valuable theological and religious books into Armenian, Greek, and Turkish.

*Charles C. Starbuck.*

ANDOVER.

---

#### THE APPRENTICE SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

To man the new cruisers effectively and promptly is one of the difficult tasks that is imposed upon the Navy Department during the rebuilding of the navy. All of the new cruisers are short-handed, and ships are frequently ready for commission and are needed for service on the different stations, but they cannot be commissioned for want of men. This is not due to any difficulty in finding men who are willing to serve in the navy. The number allowed by law is easily obtained; hundreds are rejected each year because they do not come up to the standard, either physically or mentally. One difficulty is, according to the Revised Statutes relating to the enlistment of seamen for the navy, there can only be upon the rolls of the Navy Department *at one time*, the names of 7,500 seamen — ordinary seamen, lands-

men, mechanics, firemen, and coal-heavers — and 750 apprentices, a total of 8,250 men and boys. Consequently one ship must go out of commission to make the necessary vacancies before the complement of another ship can be enlisted. But the want of more men is not so serious a difficulty in regard to the efficiency of the crews of our new ships as is the necessity of having reliable petty officers for the important stations that belong to that class. More men can, and doubtless will, be allowed by Congress during the coming session, but reliable petty officers must be educated. The apprentice system of the naval service was established for the purpose of furnishing sailors from whom petty officers could be selected. To secure the services of the apprentices who have been educated by the government, after the expiration of their apprenticeship, is at present the most important matter in regard to the efficient manning of the new ships.

There have been several attempts to establish an apprentice system for the navy, all of which have failed for want of controlling power and proper system in the various school-ships, except the system now in operation. The first act establishing an apprentice system was approved March 2, 1837, which provided for the enlistment of boys for the navy between the ages of thirteen and eighteen, who were to serve until they were twenty-one years old. Many enlistments followed the passage of this act, and the boys were sent on board the line-of-battle ships *North Carolina* and *Columbus*, and the receiving-ships at New York and Norfolk. The orders of the Secretary of the Navy directed that the apprentices were to be thoroughly instructed, so as to be able to perform the duties of seamen and petty officers. Mr. Secretary Paulding, under whose auspices the system was established, said, in his report of November 30, 1839: "Should this system of apprenticeship be carried to the extent of which it is susceptible, I look forward to it as a source of great and lasting benefit to the navy. There is every reasonable prospect of its becoming a nursery for the supply of petty officers, one of the most important constituents in the service; nor can I doubt that it may be the means of supplying a large number of capable, intelligent seamen, more strongly attached to their country by the benefits she has conferred on them." Mr. Paulding was correct in his statement that the petty officers are "one of the most important constituents in the service," and had the system of 1837 been properly organized, no doubt much good would have resulted from it. Unfortunately the object of the apprentice sys-

tem — to educate petty officers and seamen — was not fully explained or understood, and many boys enlisted with the impression that they were in time to be advanced to the grade of midshipmen, and thereby enter the line of promotion to the highest rank in the service. By means of political influence, two or three boys were appointed midshipmen. The less fortunate became discontented, and many applied for their discharges. Those who had strong political influence were successful; those who were without influence were unsuccessful, and many deserted. After a few years the apprentice system of 1837 died out without apparent benefit to the service.

The next attempt on the part of the government to establish an apprentice system was in March, 1864, after the attention of the Navy Department had been called to the apprentice system of the English navy. At that time the department again authorized the enlistment of boys under the act of 1837, and the frigate *Sabine*, the sloop-of-war *Saratoga* and *Portsmouth* were selected as the school-ships. The enlistments continued with much success during the summer, but the Secretary of the Navy, in his annual report to Congress, advocated the promotion to midshipmen of a certain number of boys, which introduced the same element of discontent as experienced in 1839. The secretary said: "Commencing as apprentices on the school-ships, it would be well to open to the sailor-boy the way to promotion by giving him an opportunity, if he shall deserve it, of entering the Naval Academy. From among the apprentices on the school-ship a selection of one half of the midshipmen annually appointed might be made with great advantage to the service and the country. It would popularize the navy, and open to those who may have enlisted the highest positions and honors of the service." It was within the power of the secretary to put his recommendation into practice without an act of Congress, as he was directed by law to fill all vacancies that might exist in the different congressional districts after the first of July of each year. Consequently several apprentices were selected in 1864 and during the next three years, and were appointed as midshipmen at the Naval Academy. There are at present nine lieutenants on the active list of the navy who were appointed from the training-ships during the years above mentioned. The records of those officers prove that the Secretary of the Navy made no mistake in selecting them for the line of promotion to "the highest positions and honors of the service." But the very means that was expected to popularize the appren-

tice system destroyed it. As soon as it was known that a number of the enlisted boys were selected each year for midshipmen's appointments, many boys who were unable to obtain congressional appointments to the Naval Academy were enlisted for the sole purpose of gaining admission to that institution. Some of them, as above stated, were successful. Those who failed were naturally dissatisfied with the prospects before them, and the same results followed in regard to discharges and desertions as were experienced in 1839. The system of 1864 lingered a few years and died out.

Nothing was done of any practical importance by the Navy Department in regard to the enlistment of boys after the failure of 1864 until April, 1875, when a circular was issued stating that a number of boys between the ages of sixteen and seventeen would be enlisted under the provisions of the act of Congress of March, 1837. The number of men and boys allowed at that time was 7,500, but in May, 1879, an act was approved authorizing the enlistment of 750 boys besides the number of seamen then allowed. This was the commencement of the apprentice system of the naval service now in operation, — a system that has educated some of the most reliable and most valuable men in the navy, sailors who are equal, if not superior to, any class of seamen in the world.

The regulations governing the enlistment and education of apprentices have been changed from time to time as experience suggested, but are practically the same as those established in 1875. The headquarters of the Naval Training Station, as it is called, is at Coasters' Harbor Island, in Narragansett Bay, near Newport, R. I. Six ships are assigned to the special work connected with the apprentices, — the *Richmond*, which is the stationary training-ship at Coasters' Harbor Island; the *Minnesota*, at the foot of West 27th Street, New York; the *New Hampshire*, at New London, Connecticut; and the practice-ships *Jamestown*, *Portsmouth*, and *Monongahela*. Boys can be enlisted on board the stationary training-ships *Richmond*, *Minnesota*, and *New Hampshire*; also on board the receiving-ships at the navy yards at Boston, League Island, and Washington, and on board the *Michigan*, which is stationed on the Great Lakes. According to the Revised Statutes, the boys must be between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, and must enlist "to serve in the navy until they shall arrive at the age of twenty-one years." The regulations of the Navy Department state: "Boys enlisted for the naval service

must be of robust frame, intelligent, of perfectly sound and healthy constitution, free from any physical defects or malformation, and not subject to fits." Their height, weight, and measure must be as follows :—

Age.	Height.	Weight.	Chest measurement—breathing naturally.
Fourteen to fifteen . . .	4 feet 9 inches.	70 pounds.	26 inches.
Fifteen to sixteen . . .	4 feet 11 inches.	80 pounds.	27 inches.
Sixteen to seventeen . .	5 feet 1 inch.	90 pounds.	28 inches.
Seventeen to eighteen . .	5 feet 2 inches.	100 pounds.	29 inches.

The general rule is that the boys must be able to read and write, although they are enlisted if they show a general intelligence and their reading and writing are imperfect. Great care is taken in the selection of boys, especially to keep out of the training-ships boys who have served sentences in reform schools or prisons, or who have been convicted of any crime. Each boy presenting himself for enlistment must be accompanied by his father, if living, or by his mother or his guardian, who must give a written consent to the boy's enlistment, make oath to the fact of being the parent or legal guardian, and relinquish all claim to his services and compensation during his enlistment. In case the parent or guardian cannot accompany the boy, blank forms are furnished, on application, for the necessary oath and written consent. The boy is examined by a board of officers, of which the senior medical officer of the ship is a member. If they decide that he is in every respect fit for the navy, the engagement to serve until twenty-one years old is read and carefully explained to the boy. If he voluntarily agrees to its terms, he is enlisted as a third-class apprentice, with a pay of nine dollars per month and one daily ration. Upon enlisting, the apprentice is given an outfit of clothing not exceeding in value the sum of forty-five dollars. This outfit is furnished upon the supposition that the apprentice will serve during his minority ; if he is discharged at his own request, or at the request of his parents or friends, prior to the completion of his term at the training station and the first practice cruise, the value of such clothing as may have been issued must be refunded.

As soon as practicable after enlistment, the boys are sent to the

stationary training-ship Richmond, where they remain for six months for instruction in English studies and in the rudiments of seamanship and gunnery. The instruction in English studies embraces reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, geography, history of the United States, history of the navy, writing from dictation, and vocal instruction. The apprentices are thoroughly instructed in practical seamanship and the duties of a sailor. Under this head are included model and draft instruction, knotting and splicing, handling sails, reeving running rigging, handling spars and yards, sailmaking, blocks and purchases, anchors and chains, marlin-spike work, pulling and sailing boats, signals, compass and steering, lead and log lines, and swimming. The instruction in gunnery consists of descriptions of the guns and carriages, the calls to and at quarters; the stations and exercise at great guns, howitzers, and machine guns; knowledge of the different kinds of ammunition and the construction of magazines; broadsword drill, infantry tactics, target practice, and bugle instruction. A certain number of apprentices are selected and trained as buglers, and serve as such when drafted into the general service. Each of these three departments, English, seamanship, and gunnery, is in charge of a commissioned officer, who is held responsible for the proper instruction of the apprentices. The instruction in each department is given by men enlisted as schoolmasters, who are paid forty-five dollars a month. Besides their duties as schoolmasters, the men holding those rates are expected to keep a general supervision over the apprentices, and give them such advice and attention as will be conducive to their contentment and progress. Monthly reports are made by the head of each department to the commanding officer, showing the proficiency of each apprentice. As soon as an apprentice is familiar with decimal fractions and understands the method and statement of his accounts with the paymaster, has completed United States history, and understands geography fairly well, and is able to read and write readily, he is reported as qualified in English studies, and his whole attention is directed to seamanship and gunnery.

Besides receiving instruction in the departments above mentioned, the apprentices are taught how to care for, wash, and mend their clothes; they are also carefully trained in reference to their appearance and deportment. Cleanliness of person, clothing, and bedding are rigidly enforced. Slovenly habits and awkwardness are corrected; vulgar or profane language, insubordinate or violent conduct, shirking or skulking, and the use of tobacco are discour-



tenanced and prevented as far as possible. Dancing and all kinds of amusements are encouraged, and whenever a boy shows by his conduct and attention to duty that he is worthy of advancement, he is promoted to second and first class apprentice, with an increase of pay of one dollar a month for each advancement. Leave to visit their homes for forty-eight hours is granted upon the written request of their parents, and every indulgence is shown the boys that is conducive to the discipline of the ships. But the boy who makes no progress in his studies, or who has a pernicious influence over his associates, is separated from his companions, and after careful investigation, if the charges are proved, is dismissed from the service, if within the limits of the United States, or on return thereto, if he is serving in the practice-ships or general cruisers.

The discipline on board the training-ships and general cruisers is enforced with firmness and consistency, and it seldom happens that severe punishments are necessary. Admonitions and other mild means are first tried, and severe punishments are only inflicted for gross and repeated infringements of the regulations. The following named punishments are generally found sufficient for the discipline of the apprentices: Toeing a seam on the quarter deck, the length of time depending on the offense; extra masthead lookout; quarantine for one month; extra watch for a week; withholding liberty money for a month; solitary confinement for five days on bread and water. Whenever severer punishments are thought to be necessary, a general or summary court-martial is ordered.

As soon as the boys are advanced sufficiently, which is generally six months after their enlistment, they are transferred from the stationary training-ship to the practice-ships *Monongahela*, *Portsmouth*, and *Jamestown*, during the spring and autumn of each year, for further instruction and the usual cruise. These vessels are fitted only with sails, and cruise during the summer in European waters, keeping at sea most of the time, and during the winter they cruise among the West Indies. On the return of the ships, after the winter cruise, to Coasters' Harbor Island, the headquarters of the training squadron, the commanding officers of the training-ships are directed to furnish the officer in command of the station the name of the apprentice on board each ship that is considered to be the most proficient in the duties of a man-of-war's-man. The boy must also be satisfactory in obedience, industry, and conduct. The selected apprentices are ex-

amined by a board of officers in practical subjects, such as knotting and splicing, sail-making, heaving the lead and log, signals, duties of a gun captain, smallarm target practice, sword exercise, swimming, sewing, knowledge of their accounts with the paymaster, and condition of their clothing. The boy who receives the highest marks at the examination is given the Bailey gold medal, which was instituted by the late Rear Admiral Bailey for the purpose of inciting the apprentices of the navy to greater effort in acquiring a knowledge of their profession. Besides this special examination, at the expiration of the winter cruise, all the apprentices are examined at the same time, and those found qualified are transferred to the regular cruisers, as opportunity offers. By the time this transfer takes place, which is after a year's instruction in the cruising training-ships, the boys are invariably found to be a most valuable part of the crew of a man-of-war. They have been well drilled in the manual of arms, and such guns as are on board the practice-ships; know how to handle boats; are familiar with the rigging and different parts of a ship; many know how to steer and heave the lead; they have learned the etiquette of the quarter deck, the importance of quick movements on board ship and attention to duty, the necessity of ready and implicit obedience to orders, and many other things which cultivate that *aye! aye! spirit* so characteristic of the men of the sea.

Upon transfer to the regular cruisers the apprentices are stationed in different parts of the ship, and are changed from one part to another every three months, in order to acquaint them with the stations and duties in all parts. Their studies are continued with as much care as circumstances will permit. Quarterly examinations are held by a board of officers appointed by the commanding officer, and upon the recommendation of the board the boys are advanced to seamen apprentices of the second and first class, with a pay of nineteen and twenty-four dollars respectively. Apprentices, whose terms of enlistment expire while cruising on foreign stations, are sent to the United States for their discharge, unless they wish to reënlist. Those who return from a cruise in the general service, whose enlistments have not expired, are granted a leave of absence for one month, and are paid half the money due them, if their conduct has been such as to entitle them to special consideration. When their leave expires they are assigned to other cruising ships, or to the stationary training-ships if they have but a short time to serve.

At the expiration of the enlistment of the apprentices they are given an honorable discharge and continuous-service certificate if their conduct entitles them to recommendation for the same by their commanding officer. This discharge entitles the recipient to a bounty of three months' pay of the rate which he held when discharged, and the continuous-service certificate authorizes an increase of one dollar per month to the pay prescribed for that rating, should he reënlist for three years within three months from the date of his last discharge. If the apprentice's conduct and progress is such that he is not recommended for an honorable discharge, — called "a big discharge," — he receives "a small discharge," which carries no privileges.

From the above sketch it will be seen that the boys who enlist as apprentices in the navy receive sufficient education in English for a man-of-war's-man, are carefully instructed in practical seamanship and gunnery, and are given a thorough training, resulting in the important habit of caring for their person and clothing, the forming of this second nature being by no means the easiest part of their training. When discharged they are well equipped for the duties that pertain to a man-of-war; and if they would reënlist, the crews of our ships would soon be composed of the best trained men afloat. The difficulty is, but few of the apprentices remain in the service. It is estimated that not more than one tenth of them reënlist after completing their apprenticeship. In explanation of this misfortune, Commodore Ramsay, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, says in his report of 1890 to the Secretary of the Navy: "Many boys enter the navy for the novelty of the life, of which they soon tire; and many are entered by their parents apparently with a view to having their boys educated and disciplined before putting them at other work. Large numbers of boys present themselves for enlistment as apprentices, but many are rejected for physical disqualifications, and some of those accepted fail to report. The average number enlisted annually falls below the number allowed by law, and the gain to the service has not been encouraging."

The officers who have expressed themselves in papers read and discussed at the Naval Institute at Annapolis, and at its branches at the various naval stations, are generally of the opinion that, in order to keep the apprentices in the navy, many changes will have to be made in regard to the pay, rates, and other inducements now offered the enlisted men. These inducements are evidently not sufficient to hold the men, who would be very useful on board

the new cruisers. According to law, besides the benefits of the honorable discharge already mentioned, a late act of Congress allows any person receiving such a discharge "to elect a home on board of any of the receiving-ships during any portion of the three months granted by law as the limit of time within which to receive the pecuniary benefit of such discharge, the men so choosing a home to be entitled to one ration per day for their keeping while furnished with such home." The laws of Congress also provide for the payment of four per cent. interest on the men's earnings, and money deposited for interest cannot be forfeited by sentence of a court-martial, but is forfeited by desertion. A pension of eight dollars a month is allowed for total disability or death, with the same allowance to the widow and minor children. The Revised Statutes require that preference shall be given, in the appointment of warrant officers (gunners, carpenters, sailmakers, and boatswains) in the naval service, to apprentices who have served during their minority and reënlisted within three months after their discharge to serve for three or more years. The inducements offered by the regulations of the Navy Department consist of the continuous-service certificate and increase of pay, as previously mentioned. Money prizes are awarded to those who are most proficient at target practice, and the men are encouraged to qualify as marksmen. A good-conduct badge is also given to any man holding a continuous-service certificate, upon the expiration of his enlistment, who is distinguished for obedience and sobriety and is proficient in seamanship or gunnery. After he receives three badges he is enlisted, if qualified for the duties, as a petty officer, and cannot be reduced to a lower rating except by sentence of a court-martial. The ratings of petty officers are generally established by the commanding officer, who has the power to reduce those whom he rates to the ratings they enlisted under. The department also provides by regulation for the classification of the crew in regard to their conduct, and directs the amount of money each class is allowed to draw of their monthly pay, and the liberty to be granted in healthy ports. A few years ago the rate of seaman gunner, with a pay of twenty-six dollars per month, was established, and all men holding a continuous-service certificate who are qualified to reënlist as seamen or petty officers, if they are under thirty-two years of age, and can read and write and understand the fundamental rules of arithmetic, are sent to the navy yard at Washington for special training in the gun-shops, and afterwards to the torpedo station at Newport for

instruction in torpedo work, electricity, manufacture and care of gun-cotton, and diving. These men are carefully instructed in regard to the guns and carriages in use on board the new ships, especially how to make the necessary repairs in case of accident; are given a large amount of rifle and revolver practice; and receive sufficient instruction of a practical character, concerning the electrical appliances that are now used in the navy, to enable them to make repairs and take charge of the dynamos. The seamen gunners are men of high intelligence, and are the nearest approach to the ideal future man-of-war's-man that is to be found afloat in any navy. The special training that they receive fits them for the responsibilities of the petty officer class to which they are assigned, and has doubtless persuaded many men to remain in the service. The latest inducement offered the enlisted men of the navy is continued service on board the receiving-ships at the navy yards, and the stationary ships connected with the apprentice system. Men who have served for twenty years are allowed to choose which ship they wish to serve in, and are allowed all the benefits of honorable discharge and continuous-service certificates while attached to those ships.

How to hold on to the apprentices, seamen gunners, and other desirable men, is a question of vital importance to the navy. There are about 1,400 continuous-service men in the navy, and one half of the enlisted men are American citizens; but the complements of the new ships are largely composed of foreigners and men of the seafaring class who have seen but little service in the navy. It is supposed, by those who have carefully studied the situation, that the immediate step to be taken is to increase the pay of the men, and especially that of the petty officers. The pay of the petty officers of the seamen class is twenty-seven, thirty, and thirty-five dollars per month. To this class are promoted the apprentices and seamen gunners, and it is essentially the military branch of the service. The master-at-arms, apothecaries, writers, schoolmasters, bandmasters, yeomen (men who have charge of the store-rooms), ship's cook, and others are known as special class petty officers, whose pay ranges from twenty-eight to sixty-five dollars. The artificer class of petty officers comprises the machinists, boiler-makers, armorers, blacksmiths, carpenters' mates, sailmakers' mates, printers, painters, and others, who receive from thirty to seventy dollars per month. The men who belong to the seamen class proper — the apprentices, landsmen, ordinary seamen, seamen, and seamen gunners — are

paid from nine to twenty-six dollars. The seamen of the special class are the tailors, barbers, lamp-lighters, jacks-of-the-dust, bay-men (nurses), and musicians. This class is paid from eighteen to thirty-three dollars. The seamen of the artificer class are the coal-heavers, firemen, carpenters, and caulkers, whose pay is from twenty-two to thirty-five dollars. From this statement it is seen that the petty officers and seamen of the seamen class proper receive the least pay. The subject of pay for the men has been carefully considered by a board of officers, and their report is in the hands of the President. By the Revised Statutes, the pay allowed the enlisted men of the naval service is fixed by the President, but he cannot exceed the amount appropriated for such purpose for any one year. It is an open secret that the President is ready to comply with the recommendations of the board to increase the men's pay as soon as Congress appropriates the money.

The other changes, besides increase of pay, that are thought advisable are to increase the number of apprentices from 750 now allowed to 1,500, and to enlist the apprentices to serve until they are twenty-four years of age. By keeping them until that age, they will be more likely to have formed an attachment for naval associations, and with the advantages of retirement on three fourths pay after thirty years' service, as provided by law for the army and marine corps, and the other considerations below mentioned, it is supposed that the men will seek reënlistment. The petty officers' rates and regular advancement of the men must be arranged and more firmly established. At present, for a man to enlist as a petty officer he must have twelve years' continuous service, hold three good-conduct badges, and obtain each year very high marks in regard to various qualifications. As a rule, the rates in the different ships are given by the commanding officer, who has power to reduce any rating established by himself. While this power is used generally with good judgment, and competent petty officers who are well-behaved are not disturbed in their rates, yet the fact remains that a man can be reduced in rate without any reason being given or charges preferred, as the regulations only require the disrating to be entered in the ship's log.

There is room also for improvement in the men's quarters, — both berthing and messing, even in our new ships. An extension of the authority and responsibility of the petty officers, with an increase of time between discharge and reënlistment for the con-

tinuous-service men to six months, with pay for three months as now allowed by law, are recommended as improvements on the present system. The enlisted men should also be given an allowance for clothing, as is the case with the army and marine corps, and every law granting privileges to the enlisted men of the army should be amended to include those of the navy. At present there are strange discrepancies. Commodore Ramsay says in his report of October, 1890: "It is recommended that section 2166 of the Revised Statutes be so amended that an enlisted man serving in the United States Navy may become a naturalized citizen of the United States in the same manner as now provided for enlisted men of the United States Army. A seaman gunner in the navy has recently been refused American citizenship in New York, notwithstanding he made his declaration in this city in April last. This man has served in the navy seven years, holds a continuous-service certificate from the Navy Department and a certificate as a seaman gunner, having successfully passed through the gunnery schools at Washington and Newport. If such men cannot become citizens of the United States, the country gains nothing by educating them."

The fact is, the time has come when the government needs the best men for the naval service. They must be intelligent, able-bodied, disciplined, and carefully trained for the new duties on board the new ships. Some of these men need the expert training which the seamen gunners receive at the Washington navy yard and at the torpedo station. All of them should be sufficiently paid, and protected by law and regulation, so that the advancement of the deserving should be assured; and the naval service should offer such inducements to American boys and young men that it may be considered not only, as it is, an honorable career, but an attractive one.

*Albion V. Wadhams.*

UNITED STATES NAVY.

---

### THE PROPOSED REFORM OF THE GRAMMAR SCHOOL CURRICULUM.

THE Faculties of the New England Colleges, comprising the "Association of Colleges in New England," have before them for consideration the following circular:—



At the 35th Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges in New England, held at Brown University, Nov. 5, 6, 1891, it was

*Voted*, That the memorandum printed below be transmitted to the various Faculties for their consideration, and for action by this Association next year ; also,

*Voted*, That the memorandum, with a statement of this reference of the same to the Faculties, be offered to the press for publication.

#### MEMORANDUM.

The Association of Colleges in New England, impressed with the real unity of interest and the need of mutual sympathy and help throughout the different grades of public education, invites the attention of the public to the following changes in the programme of New England grammar schools, which it recommends for gradual adoption :

1. The introduction of elementary natural history into the earlier years of the programme as a substantial subject to be taught by demonstrations and practical exercises rather than from books.

2. The introduction of elementary physics into the later years of the programme as a substantial subject, to be taught by the experimental or laboratory method, and to include exact weighing and measuring by the pupils themselves.

3. The introduction of elementary algebra at an age not later than twelve years.

4. The introduction of elementary plane geometry at an age not later than thirteen years.

5. The offering of opportunity to study French, or German, or Latin, or any two of these languages, from and after the age of ten years.

In order to make room in the programme for these new subjects, the Association recommends that the time allotted to arithmetic, geography, and English grammar be reduced to whatever extent may be necessary. The association makes these recommendations in the interest of the public-school system as a whole ; but most of them are offered more particularly in the interest of those children whose education is not to be continued beyond the grammar school.

JOHN HOWARD APPLETON, *Secretary.*

A few introductory words are necessary, in explanation of this memorandum. It emanated from an association which comprises nearly all the colleges in New England, — women's colleges excepted. Each college sends its president and one professor to the annual meeting, and the gathering at Providence was a full and representative one. The function of the association is to consult and advise, not to legislate either for the colleges or any one else. Secondly, this memorandum is purely tentative. It is a provisional expression of the all but unanimous view of the gen-

tllemen gathered at Providence, and is referred to the college faculties for their consideration, and suggested as a topic to come before next year's association at Williamstown. Further, the subject of grammar schools was not down upon the programme of the Providence meeting, but spontaneously "broke out," like something that could not be suppressed, and was discussed with a heartiness and seriousness that indicated conviction and profound interest. The gentleman who threw this live question among them was a professor who has long been intimately connected with public school management, and spoke from their point of view. This leads to the observation that it will not do to charge the gentlemen of the association with impractical theorizing upon a subject foreign to them. Aside from the fact that probably each one of them spoke from a sad experience of wasted years in the grammar school, many had come from careers in the public schools, and others had for years made the subject their study, and spoke with authority. Upon public school questions the President of Amherst or the President of Harvard would command attention anywhere.

It is to be noted again that as the question did not start from the point of view of the colleges, so the discussion was not carried on from the college point of view. The changes proposed were discussed as valuable and necessary in themselves. If it was recognized that they might operate to make a boy or girl desire a college education who has not that desire now, and would make it easier to gratify such a desire, this fact is surely not an argument against them.

It should further be remarked that the changes are recommended "for gradual adoption." The speakers fully recognized how radical a change was involved, and by no means deluded themselves with the idea that the school system of the United States could be reconstructed in a day.

On the other hand, the programme was not intended to be an ideal one, either in the sense that it is Utopian and beyond the possibility of exact realization, or in the sense of being the best possible. Doubtless experience will modify it in detail, but it is believed to be thoroughly practicable, and in the line of healthy progress.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of the grammar school in our public school system. Practically the grammar school is the finishing school for nearly our entire population; they get no instruction beyond the fifteenth year when they leave

the grammar school. If now the grammar school curriculum is radically wrong, or deficient, in just so far we, as a people, are being educated incompletely or wrongly.

It is all but unanimously agreed that such is the case. No more severe indictment of the present system has been published than in a paper read before the New York University Convocation in July, 1889, by Principal E. R. Payne, of Binghamton. "It has been stated that there are 8,000,000 children in the elementary schools of our country, 250,000 pupils in the secondary schools, and 60,000 students in the colleges. . . . The average age at which children enter academic grades cannot be far from fourteen; probably nearer fifteen. Up to that time they have devoted their time and attention mainly to arithmetic, geography, and grammar. . . . From these the great majority of children get all the systematic training which they ever receive. Is this enough? Could not the same amount of energy be spent to better advantage by curtailing and remodeling instruction in these studies and branching out in other directions? We are slaves to arithmetic, geography, and grammar, and it may cost a struggle to get free." "Upon leaving the grammar school," he continues, "children have not sufficient power of independent work; they lack interest and enthusiasm in study, and their school information does not extend in the most helpful directions. The ordinary German gymnasium boy of fourteen or fifteen has accomplished a great deal more intellectual work than his American contemporary. He probably knows at least as much about Latin as our boys of seventeen or eighteen. He has had some Greek and French. He has learned a great deal about the myths, legends, history, and prominent personages of his own country, together with its special geography; . . . he has studied geometry and algebra; . . . he has learned by heart more masterpieces of his native literature than our boy ever learns. If the boy be in the 'real school,' instead of a gymnasium, he has had considerable natural history, zoölogy, and botany, in place of the Greek,—above all, he has learned to apply himself. . . . A French boy only gives to arithmetic in the lycée one third of the time that our boys give to it, and he goes on to the higher mathematics well enough. Why should scholars be kept on arithmetic every day for six or eight years?" In regard to geography, he quotes Dr. E. E. White, of Cincinnati: "The time devoted to ordinary geography in the higher grades of elementary schools should be shortened, and one or two years given to an inspiring and broadening study of

geography as a science." After saying that technical grammar should not be taught, because from it one never learns either to speak or read, Principal Payne concludes: "The true course to pursue is to see to it that there is a better preparation for higher grades *at the same age as now*. What shall we use to fill up the time, if we gain any time by better teaching and less exclusive attention to the old standards? I answer without hesitation, elementary science." Principal Bunten, of Ulster Academy, followed in the same vein: "I believe that too much time is expended on certain parts of geography. It would be better if they were not required to learn the names of every little ditch in Europe or Africa. . . . Do not require them to master all these details; it is a mere effort of memory without any practical value. I believe that some elementary science should be taught in grammar schools." In regard to natural sciences, the American Society of Naturalists, at the Baltimore meeting, recommended:

"1. Instruction in natural sciences should commence in the lowest grades of the primary schools, and should continue throughout the curriculum.

"2. In the lower grades the instruction should be chiefly by means of object lessons; and the aim should be to awaken and guide the curiosity of the child in regard to natural phenomena, rather than to present systematized bodies of fact and doctrine."

In a memorable but rather optimistic address before the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, some two years ago, President Dwight, of Yale, said: "Of natural sciences, I may venture to say that enough should be done in the earliest days to awaken the boy's powers of observation and his interest in this department of knowledge." In regard to the postponing of modern languages until the period of facility in acquiring had passed, he said: "It was a weary task for months or years. . . . Effort and precious time were hopelessly lost forever. The retrospect becomes only the more melancholy when we discover how needless the task was. The children of our households to-day may gain the same thing that we gained at five and twenty, and far more than we gained, *when they are ten or twelve*." After remarking upon the strange lack of appreciation of the value of the early school years, President Dwight concludes that "the ordinary boy of our educated families lost, in my judgment, under the old system of school education, from two to three years out of the seven that were allotted for his earlier studies." As the loss is entirely in the earlier years, he would doubtless not confine it to boys pre-

paring for college, though, considering the occasion, he had them exclusively in mind. President C. K. Adams, of Cornell University, said to the New York Convocation of July, 1888: "I have been interested in looking over the superintendent's report, with regard to the schools of the different cities and States. That report shows that the boys average a little more than fifteen years of age, that the girls are a little more than fifteen years and nine months of age, when they leave the grammar school. And what have they learned at the end of fifteen years? A little knowledge of reading, arithmetic, and geography, and have had (?) two terms of algebra. I am obliged to confess that they have accomplished what seems to be very small results compared with what I have seen in corresponding grades of schools in other countries."

Mr. F. A. Hill, head master of the Cambridge English High School, said in a recent paper: "The time has come to consider the wisdom of increasing the range and the grade of scholarship within the present limits of the grammar school. . . . The arithmetic course should be reduced to make room for algebra and geometry, — algebra through equations of the first degree, and geometry in a way to test the observing, inventive, and reasoning faculties, but with recognition of the fact that its principles can be grasped for practical purposes long before it is possible for the average pupil to give the formal and vigorous demonstrations of Euclid. Elementary science should have a place. There is something seriously defective in our teaching, if under it pupils do not gain in power to see and to think. Geography should be made an observational study to an increased extent. This can be effected with the aid of the portelumière, a darkened room, and stereopticon views. I hesitate to recommend an additional language for the grammar schools. Latin would hardly be tolerated. I fear it would be difficult, except in highly intelligent communities, to convince the public that French or German ought to be taken up in our grammar schools, although it is the practice abroad to begin a modern language very early."

The condition of too many grammar schools corresponds to that of the Quincy grammar schools under the old régime, as described by Mr. C. F. Adams: "It was found that the A and B grammar scholars throughout the town could parse and construe sentences, and point out the various parts of speech with great facility, yet when called upon to write an ordinary letter they were utterly unable to apply the rules and principles they had so painfully learned, or to form single sentences or to follow any rule of

composition." In reading, "the greater part of the scholars could merely stammer and bungle along, much as a better educated person does when reading a book in some language with which he is only imperfectly acquainted. In other words, it appeared, as the result of eight years' school-teaching, that the children, as a whole, could neither write with facility nor read fluently."

To express this indictment of the grammar schools along the lines of the discussion at Providence: Boys and girls after nine years' instruction leave school entirely, or enter the high school, trained in three subjects exclusively, arithmetic, grammar, and geography. In arithmetic, besides what President Walker considers the necessary training in addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, and simple fractions, — they have spent years over puzzling, complicated, and unreal problems of all kinds. In grammar they, mere children, have studied definitions and terms abstract and metaphysical, to the last degree; they know nothing of good literature, and are without the power of correct expression. In geography they have memorized thousands of names, often mispronounced, and have no idea of the actual configuration of the earth or its physical constitution. They have passed the age when foreign languages are easily acquired, to remain in entire ignorance of them, or to learn them painfully afterwards, when they should be applying them. They go into life with no conception of modern science, their powers of observation untrained, and their interests unexcited. They have received a purely abstract training, at an age when abstractions are most foreign to mental processes. It follows that so unnatural a process must be long and tedious, — taking from two to three years of time unnecessarily. These fundamental subjects might be better taught in much less time, and the years gained employed upon subjects natural to the period, elementary science studied in the concrete, and languages according to the natural method.

In the discussion at Providence the objections to the proposed changes were seen to be chiefly of a practical kind, and their great weight was fully acknowledged. They group themselves under three general heads, relating to inability on the part of pupils, teachers, and tax-payers respectively. As regards the pupils: In the University Convocation of 1889, Principal J. E. Sherwood, of Albany, declared that the public-school pupils were so uncouth and rough, so lacking in will-power, that it took the whole grammar school period to tame them and "get rid of the dross." It is said that the process of education must be different for the children of

ignorant foreigners, or debauched and brutal parentage, from what it should be for those who come from comfortable New England homes. Certainly it should never be forgotten that the average mind is only to be trained by constant repetition, by a soaking process that must take time. It would seem, however, that the boy who had studied arithmetic four or five years would be ready at twelve to turn to elementary algebra, and to geometry at thirteen, or *vice versa*. Algebra illuminates arithmetic, as most of us remember, and geometry, with models and moulding, is objective enough for the dullest. Indeed, one can venture the prediction that it is just those who get along worst under the present literary system who would be most interested in the study of concrete things. But our educational system is plastic enough to allow of any modification of the proposed scheme in the interest of any particularly backward or difficult communities. This suggests a fundamental error of our present system. As far as it has any uniformity, it is a uniformity graded to the capacity of the dullest. This is wrong, a hardship to all who are thus made to walk the dullard's pace. We shall be obliged to have in our cities separate schools for those of slow and feeble intellects, — who are yet not idiots, — as they have abroad. The grading should be just rapid enough to stimulate the average boy and girl to do their best.

The real answer, after all, to this objection is that the proposed programme is in successful operation in the Ethical Society's Workingman's School in New York, and is practically that of the German and French schools; and it will not do for the American boy to confess an inferiority in brightness to his German or French contemporary. The truth is, that the American boy is not willing to work as hard as they, — at least over his books. As a school committee-man of long experience remarked the other day: "Parents are mightily afraid their children shall overwork, and they take the children's word for it too." Our school year is on the average about six weeks shorter than the German year, — a not unimportant fraction of the year. It is this willingness to be trained in school, and use of the best methods that makes out of the German boys the greatest scholars ever known, and the most successful traders of the commercial world.

It is objected further that the successful teaching of elementary science and of languages to children requires capacity in the teacher not now to be found. This is simply saying that we must have a higher grade of teachers, — not simply teachers better



trained, though this must follow. As Mr. C. W. Bardeen has said with much directness: "The principal deficiency of our school-work of to-day is brains; a good deal of brains gets into the teacher's profession, but comparatively little stays there." If the new grammar-school programme requires better teaching than we have now, the higher grade of teachers will be forthcoming to do the work, *provided* they are attracted to it by substantial emoluments. This means (1) expert and non-partisan supervision; (2) fixity of tenure, with promotion for merit; (3) a pension system, as in Germany; all these to make up for the always inadequate salary that the State can afford to pay its teachers. Is it said that this involves centralization of control? There is only one reply to this. If centralization is an indispensable condition of good schools, then let us have it.

We are now close on to the third objection, which was that the proposed grammar school system would cost more than the old. Probably it would, though the most expensive undertaking is the undertaking badly done. Moreover, many communities, for example, at Quincy, have found that efficient schools have cost less *per capita* than inefficient ones, and we are quite lavish with our public moneys in other ways. It would be interesting to figure the amount of money appropriated for public schools in our cities that, under our political ring methods, gets into the pockets of rascals, particularly in the construction department. There would, too, be some saving under the merit and pension system mentioned already.<sup>1</sup> Our popular control of schools, it would seem, obviates any danger from the side of expense. A community is sometimes taxed to death, — but no community ever taxes itself to death. The true point of resistance is not in the inability but in the unwillingness of a community to provide proper school facilities. It is upon this public opinion that the College Association hoped to operate in some small degree, in giving its memorandum to the press.

The relation of the proposed changes to the colleges may be alluded to, in conclusion. It ought to be evident that these changes make it easier for a grammar school graduate to get ready for college than under the present system. It is, now, almost out of the question for a boy without resources to span the

<sup>1</sup> The magnificent system of Prussian schools, from the elementary schools up through the university, costs but little more than half as much *per capita* of the population as that of New York State. (*Report of the New York State Department of Public Instruction*, by James Russell Parsons, Jr. 1891.)

gulf of three or four years between the grammar school and the college. At fifteen he is in no wise forwarded toward a college preparation. He is compelled to join the ranks of labor or business for which he may have no taste or qualifications. If, on the other hand, he has, at fifteen, had some algebra, geometry, and science, and the "*opportunity*" (note the word) "to study French or German or Latin, or any two of these languages from and after the age of ten years," he will already be within a year or two of college, and with the modern scholarships system, and readiness of every one to help an aspiring youth, will have no difficulty in securing a college education. This is in the line of true democracy. We want our colleges recruited from the brain and brawn of the land, not from the privileged few.

The Germans have a proverb, "*Wer die Schule hat, der hat die Zukunft des Volkes,*" which means, As are its schools, so is the nation. The last book of Aristotle's "*Politics*" is upon education, and he introduces it with the maxim, "No one will doubt that the legislator should direct his attention above all to the education of youth, or that the neglect of education does harm to states." Each generation in America cannot continue to lose three or four years out of its life without comparative national retrogression, primarily in intellectual matters, then necessarily in practical affairs. A poorly educated people cannot compete with one better educated, for all supremacy is, after all, spiritual and intellectual rather than physical. It is beginning to be acknowledged that good teaching must be a profession, not a makeshift, that it is an art, perhaps of all arts the most difficult, and certainly of all arts the most important. This is evidenced by the very recent establishment of high-grade journals devoted to education, and by the foundation of schools and chairs of Pedagogy. We may be sure that the proposed reform of the grammar school programme will be eagerly discussed by experts, and it may be confidently predicted that it will be ultimately, if "*gradually,*" adopted, in principle, if not in detail.

*D. Collin Wells.*

BOWDOIN COLLEGE, BRUNSWICK, ME.

## THE GREAT LOVE.

"He that loveth not, knoweth not God ; for God is love. Herein was the love of God manifested in (among) us, that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." — 1 JOHN iv. 8-10.

It is not possible to handle this transcendent passage concerning God without a deep sense of one's unfitness. Little headway can we make into the wide field of knowledge which it opens up to us. But it leads us in the right direction to the true knowledge of God. In it is the key to the understanding of God's being, character, and purpose. In it we are at the real A B C of permanent knowledge ; the theology of the future, of eternity. Before us lies the endless stretch, which contains — nay, as a whole, is without doubt — the revelation of glory ; even of the divine glory contained, in germ, in this rich word. So if we may get but the slightest idea of this great mystery of God, were it but a single hint, we are not doing vain work.

As ministers of the gospel, we do not speak so much of this mystery as we should. Why not ? Among other reasons, because from every side one is still forbidden to speak in a true freedom of the spirit, on this transcendent revelation of God in Christ as a God of love. From the unbelieving part of mankind comes the cry, leave it alone, lest you come in conflict with the awful God of nature, or with godless nature, "red in tooth and claw." From the believing part of mankind comes the appeal, leave it alone, lest you come in conflict with God's decrees and holiness, encourage men with false hopes, and become involved in a denial of the eternal consequences of sin. It is not mere cowardice which, under such circumstances, leads one at times to suppress utterances which lie uppermost in one's soul, when the signs are patent that men are not yet able to bear certain truths. It is fear of endangering the glory of the truth itself, which must not be exposed unnecessarily to trampling feet. At the same time, why should we not confess that, if we knew more, we should find a larger boldness to speak more unreservedly of the deep things of God. These may, indeed, lie in outline clear enough to our own vision to fill us with unspeakable joy, and yet not sufficiently clear in detail to reproduce them so plainly that we can enable others to see them as we do. I, for one, often refrain from saying

more, because of a patient waiting for a better opportunity. Our school-term is very, very long, God be praised! He that believeth need not make haste.

Sometimes, however, occasions come which urge one to speak. Very recently I was singularly impressed with the importance of bearing this testimony concerning God. A friend of mine, whom many would probably call skeptical, — I do not judge him; I consider him serious in his doubts as I am in my beliefs, — said to me in an argument the other day: "Do you *love* God?" He put the emphasis on *love*. Many times has the question been put to me since early childhood. Often have I put it to myself. But always, as I now remember, with the emphasis on *you*. Other men love God, do you also? And I have long been able to answer sincerely, yes, I do. But my friend laid emphasis on *love*. And when, after a little reflection, I answered him yes, he repeated it: "Really *love* Him, as you do your wife and children?" The emphasis startled me a little. The question appeared more serious to me than it ever had before. Yet I could not but answer yes, and I enlarged somewhat on my answer, explaining how the object modifies the feeling without changing it as affection. I do not, indeed, love God as I love my wife, nor do I love her as I love my children, nor my children as I loved my mother; but I love each with a real love. It seemed inconceivable to my friend. He could not see that there was in God anything to appeal to love. He might admit in God things to admire, to fear, — power, wisdom, terror, — but could perceive neither tenderness nor affection, such as would make the weakest of his creatures trustful towards God, and make the Eternal Creator of all things a Being with whom the heart of a man can have a more satisfactory intercourse than the intellect.

This man represents a large class of persons. Earnest, intelligent, educated, with their attentions alive to the surroundings into which they have been born. With an appreciation of the demands for righteousness which the world presents in its manifold forms. With instincts for that which is right, and generous and helpful and saving. Burdened with the suffering patent wherever investigation leads them, a suffering as plain in the dim past as in the present. Convinced of the struggle between good and evil which has been going on beyond the memory of man. Troubled because of an apparent absence of God at the heart of the struggle. Obligated, therefore, to keep up a hope for ultimate good without God, or, at the best, with only the passive interest of God

in the fight between impersonal contending forces. I need only thus describe the situation in which such souls find themselves. I need not defend them, nor apologize for them. I could do neither, though I am sorry for them. If the God of Revelation were a reality to them, they would not be compelled to hope against hope, nor would they ever be driven to despair, as many of them are driven. I have lived long enough now to appreciate their difficulties, and I do not pretend that their objections taken from the visible universe can be answered. I feel the same difficulties, and cannot answer my own objections. I can only say to such souls when they ask me what I do with my objections: I subordinate and postpone them. The field whence they spring and which they may be said to cover is but a very small part of the whole. The material universe as compared with the spiritual is but an atom. Time, as compared with eternity, is but as a drop to the ocean. All the really great questions which trouble us men belong not to time, but to eternity, where we also belong. And God is greater than all.

But here we are at the very heart of the difficulty. Can the heart of an inquiring man find its way to God? Is he not doomed, as Huxley has recently put it, to wander in the mazes of an impenetrable forest, without the least idea of where he will come out? Now there is an instinct in man, to which long ago a prophet gave expression, that men by searching cannot find out God. Increase of knowledge of his handiwork will doubtless give larger knowledge of his methods and of some of his attributes; but unless men have trust in Him, they will not get at the secret of his being. "The secret of the Lord is only with those that fear him, that hope in his mercy." That was the great lesson twice taught at that representative mountain, Horeb, to the two representative prophets of the Old Testament dispensation, Moses and Elijah.

Somehow, then, before men can rise above their doubts and difficulties they must know God, — God as He is; God, as He himself, will help them surmount their difficulties. We cannot in this ascend from the less to the greater, we must descend from the greater to the less. As the Psalmist long ago said: "By thy light do we see light." And as Paul put it: "He that spared not his own Son, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things."

In all these cases the moral sense of the individual plays the large part, and constantly a larger part. These doubters among

us are not on a level with the Gentile world. Of what value may be the conceptions of an earnest heathen who follows the light within, we need not now ask. Some will rate them higher than others. But these doubters among us have been trained amid Christian influences. Their moral sense has been developed and quickened by the revelation of God in Christ, which has affected our world to a very large degree. What the conceptions of man concerning God, truth, righteousness, and mutual duties might be in an absolute state of nature, where no ray of divine grace has penetrated, no one knows. There is no way of finding out. We need not hesitate to receive as true the darkest descriptions of a world or of a man who has, as Paul puts it, "refused to have God in their knowledge." But the real state of the case is, that where sin has abounded, grace has already much more abounded. The law written in the heart covers the whole field, summed up in that one word, love. And that law is, certainly in the Christian world, illustrated and enforced as a beneficent law, in ten thousand forms, to enlighten the conscience and mould the heart.

The demand growing out of this influence, and boldly presented in our day by many serious minds, that the teaching about God which men bring, who are professed spokesmen on behalf of God, shall not conflict with the sense of righteousness thus developed, is no unreasonable demand. Only when one has lost faith in the world as the field of the kingdom, and in the universal presence of the Holy Spirit as preparing the world for Christ, and so has lost faith in men as the objects of the drawing power of the uplifted Christ, can he assume a position of antagonism or distrust to this demand. It is ominous when preachers of the gospel start out or are sent forth with the announcement that such a demand is unsafe and is to be resisted, or when they imply that the moral laws and responsibilities under which men live are anything else than the moral attributes and examples which God, as a moral Being, exhibits. When it is right and necessary to say that God lives and acts under law, it is also right and necessary to say that He, as a moral Being, lives and acts under precisely the same laws to which He subjects all moral creatures. To put it plainly: What would be wrong in us would not be right in God in similar circumstances. On no attribute is greater stress laid in Scripture than on righteousness, a righteousness which is in fullest harmony with love.

Since that incident, it has seemed to me more impressively plain that here is the crucial truth concerning God, and here also is the

great ignorance in man, — an ignorance which devastates the life, because it robs the affections of their proper object. More than ever do I feel that necessity is laid upon the ministers of God to testify concerning God that He is love. We may not be able to do it as we should. We may not be able to prevent men from making evil use of our words. We may not be able to have as complete faith in the doctrine, as a sufficient revelation concerning God, as we should have. Such considerations, however, must not prevent us from bearing the testimony which we find in the Revelation. It is not only a proper question: Is God lovable? That is, is God a Being whom men can love? But it is the first question concerning God from which is to be expected any radical influence upon the life of a sinful man. It is perfectly plain from the Scriptures that, until a man feels the claim of love, and freely responds to it, he is neither a being in whose companionship God can take delight, nor a being who can be willing to live on any proper terms with God. The strange part is that this simple truth is practically so much ignored when in the Scriptures it is so prominent. It seems simple to us now, yet it is very striking, that when the young ruler asked Jesus what was the greatest commandment in the law, the Lord should have said that, as far back as the giving of the law at Sinai, it had been announced that the one God of men claimed the love of men as his first right; and that this was man's first privilege, and so the real basis of intercourse between men and God. So it is very striking that, according to the Lord, the acknowledgment of that fact shows a man to be not far from the kingdom of God. It is, indeed, a fundamental truth. What is all knowledge of God worth which does not cover this point of how a human heart should feel towards God? Now, also, the interview of the Lord with Peter, after his resurrection, seems to me more significant than ever. I detect a stronger emphasis of the Lord on the word "love." I see now why Peter should fence with Christ about the proper term, and how the Lord should hold him to it, until Peter insists that he cannot as yet be committed to more than his own idea of affection. At that moment love was not yet perfected in him. In course of time he would love as he was loved. And clearer than ever is to me now the comprehensive character ascribed to love by Paul in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, as it covers the whole ground of spiritual requirements in man: "Now abideth faith, hope, and love, these three, and the greatest of these is love." A mere reminder of the claims thus expressed must im-



press us that we do not give due prominence to the demand for love under the gospel. We preach faith in God — very properly. We do not, however, always make it clear enough that this faith is only a means to an end ; that it is especially important as an aid to another demand to which it is subordinate. Faith is in order to love. Why must we have faith in God, except that we may be able to love Him ? What are we to believe of God in the gospel except that He loves us, that thus we might have the eternal argument for love as the real bond between himself and us ? Just as the Lord Jesus put it in his interview with Nicodemus, recorded in John iii.

We need not enlarge on that now. Nor is there necessity to follow the course which a doubting man will suggest, and first remove whatever from our human point of view may appear as evidence that there are in God rather the opposite attributes from love. So be it. Let it be that historically in human experience the revelation of the divine love stands last, coming after the revelation of power, wisdom, holiness, justice. Let it be that the evidence for love is the last to be completed in human history. Let it be that the appeal to the past is in favor of the view which makes of God rather an object of fear and dread, than of confidence and affection. Hence, for the present, let unbelief seem to have the better of the argument. If one truly believe in the love of God, he can afford to let the question settle itself as to how the past is to be worked harmoniously into the future, for he is sure that the love of God will be justified. This is the method of the gospel, it is the method of the apostles. The gospel is an announcement, a prophecy, a promise. It appeals solely to faith, and addresses hope. It does not answer the objections which either the fear of men or the providence of God, as it lies within our ken, suggests. Men are to believe it as a promise, in the face of the difficulties which no serious mind can ignore or undervalue: God so loved the world. He that believeth shall not perish because of the apparent dangers, but shall have eternal life. Thus also Paul, dwelling with tremendous effect on the vanity to which the creation has been subjected, not of its own will, but by reason of him who subjected it, simply says: "We received not again the spirit of bondage unto fear, but the spirit of adoption, whereby we say, Abba, Father!" The very adoption for which the whole creation waits. What a splendid passage he makes of it in the Epistle to the Romans. Starting in the lowest valley of our humiliation, where death reigns through sin, through

the dark clefts of the rugged mountains, where the terror of law, the condemnation of human inability, the mysteries of divine decrees, the gloom of unbelief, resistance, hardness cast in turn shade and chill, into the uplands of free grace, self-inspired love, and saving mercy, until he brings us on to the very summit of the Mount of God, where nothing obstructs the view, — where the sun shines in glory all the day from the cloudless sky, and the great peaks of God's redemptive revelations are all bathed in the splendor of light; the high place whence God alone is visible in the eternal silence more eloquent of goodness than all words; where a devout soul can only say in boundless thankfulness: "Of him, and through him, and to him are all things. To him be the glory forever, Amen." With what effect can the apostle then turn to men wondering at the infinite glory of goodness and appeal to them: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the *mercies* of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice," — an offering of love. Is God loveable? It can definitely be answered only there.

Such is also the essence of our passage from John, to whom it was given more formally to answer that question than to any other of the Lord's messengers. For he says, in so many words, in these verses, that until one has seen that in God which enables him to live with God on the basis of love, he does not understand God — has no real and adequate conception of who God is. Does this annul all revelations concerning God previous to this, God is love? Not at all. It only completes them. It is no contradiction of the revelation from Sinai, nor of the revelation through history, nor of the revelation in man, nor of the revelation in nature. It corrects them all where they are wrongly conceived of or interpreted. In a sense, it renders them all superfluous, for the history of the revelation that God is love includes all possible manifestations of God to men. So that he who has perceived the force of this word goes through the universe with the key that unlocks all the mysteries. At no point is any revelation of God final until it has reached the point indicated in this passage. All other revelations are preparatory to it, as all previous dispensations are preparatory to the dispensation of the kingdom of God.

For a most serious error would we make at this point if we in any wise conceived of the love of any creature to God as self-originated, and in that sense spontaneous, depending simply on the self-will of the creature. As who should say, since there are before me, as capable of love, in this universe, all objects to desire

and to possess within the embrace of my affections, so that I can call them my own, and find in them the satisfaction of delight, I choose the greatest and best of them, that is, God. That is the kind of false gospel which brings to nought the grace of God. It is a pity that it is, indeed, heard so much, for it discredits the greatest truth of God, and it is based on a radically false conception of love as a principle and a motive. In God love, as all other feelings, is absolutely original and free, for God is the only Being who moves in perfect liberty, being above the necessity of giving account of any of his doings. But in the creature love is a gift, communicated by a sweetly reasonable method, by the presentation of the lovable. Sometimes in the form of an attractive object, that which a spirit really can love, and so finds itself under a sweet obligation to love with its own full consent, or else in the form of an experience of love shown toward itself, enkindling love. In no case can it be forced, imposed by command as a simple duty. It is a part of certain life-relations. In all cases true love is reasonable, mutual, and free. In the relations between creatures such simple truths are easily acknowledged as of force. A simple obligation or promise to love does not assure affection. It cannot. No less true is this of the relations between men and God.

If men do not live with God on the basis of love, this does not argue, however, either that God is not lovable, or does not love them. John says, it simply proves that they do not know God. For God is not only lovable, but his essential character is love. Now if we could have a complete definition of that term, we could get at what God really is. But this we lack, and we can only approximate to its understanding. The essential idea in it, however, we can grasp. Love is the opposite of selfishness. It is the inward pressure to be what one is and to have what one possesses for the benefit of another. This, it is here said, God has in perfection. It does not exclude other attributes. Certainly not. Yet if, in a human way of speaking, there be any attribute which may be used as the comprehensive expression of God's innermost nature as a moral Being, living with an eternal purpose worthy of himself, then, according to the Scriptures, this is the attribute, and in this word is the secret of the universe. For certain purposes it may be profitable for us to think of God as solitary in the as yet uncreated universe: "The dread Supreme, in solemn silence dwelling by himself, in vast immensity." But it is a view never presented in the Scrip-

tures. They know not of the Lone God, though they lay great stress on Him as God alone. The essential idea of God as love precludes the conception of a God unable to exercise that first attribute. Hence as through the ages the revelation is unfolded in Scripture, we find in it more and more a casting back of all things into eternity, the proper world of God, forever above all limitations of time and space. He sees the end from the beginning. All things are always present before Him. Not only those which are, but those which were, and those which will be. To God they never begin to be, they always are as objects of a real interest. Hence Paul could say of Him, that He calleth things that are not as though they were. As also the Lord had said to Jeremiah: "Before I formed thee in the belly, I knew thee." Hence all things being forever in God's thoughts could eternally enter into his purpose, and toward them He could exercise his love. This is the doctrine which Paul especially unfolds in his Epistles, applying it to the Creation as well as to the Redemption (Eph. iii. 9-11; Col. i. 14-16), it becoming real in Christ, the Eternal Son of God—in whom all things were created as well as redeemed. Separate from whom, or outside of whom (χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, John i. 3), nothing became that was made. The relation of the Father and the Son is emphasized in Scripture, whenever the doctrine of the sonship is fully revealed, as preëminently a relation of love. That is the essential idea of the term found in John, the only begotten (John i. 14, 18). As we should say, the only son of his Father, upon whom the Father lavishes all the love which in a more numerous family might be considered divided, parceled out. To bring this out Paul uses the phrase, the Son of his love (Col. i. 13). That love, of which the Eternal Son is, if we may say so, the enduring, infinite symbol, is the world of God in which his own conscious life dwells. The repeated declaration of the Father, therefore, during the incarnation of the Son: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," is the Father's announcement of the character of his own life as men and angels are to hear it from himself. Dwelling to all created beings in a light unapproachable, this is the ultimate self-revelation of Deity, which only God may witness concerning God. Whatever creature does not perceive the truth of that self-revelation, be he man or angel, does not yet know God. He may know about God. But he does not know God. He has not got hold of the secret which

is so often hidden from the wise and prudent, but is revealed to the babes, even the good pleasure — the love — of the Father.

I am aware how far this view of God in Christ as an eternal manifestation lies beyond us at present. It cannot yet be offered as a common text-book to men who inquire after God. Least of all to those among men who have only eyes as yet for visible things and not at all for the invisible realities. But it is properly presented as a reason why men should suspend judgment upon God's character when they have only or know only the visible things from which to draw conclusions. Certainly, in a controversy about God, in which his essential goodness is doubted or denied, it is a legitimate argument to say to men, Here are lines along which the eternal Love as the essential element in the divine character and purpose may be established. This is without doubt the question which men should approach with the least prejudice. It may not be theirs as yet to have the reverent, deep insight which enabled Browning to put into the mouth of David such profound words as these : —

"I have gone the whole round of creation : I saw and I spoke :  
I, a work of God's hand for the purpose, received in my brain  
And pronounced on the rest of His handiwork — returned Him again  
His creation's approval, or censure : I spake as I saw.  
I report, as man may of God's work — all 's love, yet all 's law."

Still I say that every serious man must desire that to be the verdict, rather than that God is indifferent or eternally at war with his creation. It is a worthier conception in every way than that which cannot link the Infinite One with human hope, trust, and affection. It is in harmony with the view of the Psalmist, "The Lord is good to all, and his tender mercies are over all his works. All thy works shall praise thee" (Ps. cxlv. 9, 10). Why should not every soul leave room for it, if it have not yet become a reality to him? Why should not a distracted man console himself with the thought that at some time this whole universe, which now breeds doubt for him because he is so ignorant and distrustful of God, will be to him a text-book of love, and will forever furnish him larger assurances of God as a God in whom it is good to "live, move, and have our being"?

In the mean time the brightest, most convincing chapter in God's whole library lies closest at hand. It is the chapter which begins with a manger and ends with a cross. "For in this especially was the love of God manifested in us, that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through

him." The brief statement opens up a boundless field, but as a comprehensive expression of the divine purpose in the incarnation, it is a most practical answer to the question whether God is lovable. Suppose the purpose of God is inscrutable in the creation, though this is always to be denied for God's sake and for man's sake as well; suppose the will of God in respect to his creature is unknown in the creature itself, — a thing which may be more safely admitted; suppose the bondage of death to which the creature despairingly feels himself subjected is well-founded, so far as any visible evidence is concerned; suppose then that the world ignorant of Christ has no feeling of relationship to God, and sees no such ground of hope, that it can lay hold of the future with any confidence or joy, — a thing cordially admitted: yet in Christ the purpose of God is plain, and equally the remedy for the universal evil and the ground for eternal hope and joy. Modern materialistic thought presses the question between death and life as the overshadowing question for the individual. Very properly. *It is the great question.* It has no other answer than that the atom cannot hope to escape in this universal vortex which seethes and whirls and grinds to powder with conscienceless force. When the worlds are doomed, what chance is there for man? So materialism chooses the side of death. But here, in the Incarnate Christ, God chooses the side of life, and it is set before us as the proof of God's love. It is an unanswerable demonstration. Who will gainsay it? For life is admittedly the effect of saving power when it triumphs amid scenes of death. On that most practical question, out of which come to-day the most serious objections to faith in God, because men are more than ever impressed with the grandeur of power and the strength of law, the answer given by the appearance of Christ is that "God willeth all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" — the real truth as God knows things. Why should not such a God confidently claim the love of his creature as a God who deserves love?

Grant us the historical truth of that one day on Calvary, as told in the simple story of the gospel writers, with all its incidents, and especially with its wonderful words from the cross, from "Father, forgive them" to "Father, into thy hands" — what human brain could have invented the crucifixion day! — and the testimony is irrefragable, that God is love.

When one can get hold of this essential idea, one can carry it out, and he will find it both applicable to all circumstances in

which need would appeal to love, and also corroborated by all human history read in the light of Christ revealed. John carries it out to some extent. The love of God was not called forth by the lovable-ness of man or by man's love, but the love of man was always called forth by the lovable-ness of God and his love. Love in some conception of the term is the strongest and most permanent passion of humanity. Yet history shows that the loss of the conviction of God's love may lead to the decay of love even in the most common and most natural forms — brotherly, filial, parental, conjugal. It is the perception of the love of God which has kept human love alive in the world, ennobled it, sanctified it, and made it fit for larger purposes than earthly. This in itself is a proof that human love is a gift from God and dependent on his influence. But John refers to more than this. Especially from his point of view was it impossible to ignore the influence of sin on the relations between God and man, on the human conceptions of God, and on the feelings of man toward God. It was seen everywhere and universally acknowledged, though often unintentionally, in the attitude which men took towards God, just as it is to-day. For there is no permanent response to God where his voice does not come to men through Christ. There is no harmony between men and God, no satisfaction in God, where men have not felt his love in the gift of his son. Now John says that in spite of this lack of love, nay, because of it, God manifested his love. For He manifested it in such manner that it effected a propitiation for our sins. Into the details of this it is not now necessary to go. The great truth is that Christ, as the effective antidote to those consequences of sin, which misconceived lead to a denial of the love or lovable-ness of God, is the main doctrine of the gospel. Freely may we say to an unbelieving world, that no conception of the work of Christ which detracts from it as a manifestation of the infinite love of God is just and true, whether that conception be furnished by friend or foe. "God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten Son" is the gospel in inspired form.

The Church of Christ should volunteer more and more heartily to put the gospel more simply in this shape. It is needed by the world which does not yet know God. It is demanded by the present honor of God as connected with the word of reconciliation. We often, and in a sense properly, inveigh against the pride of worldly-wise men, who set up their opinions against the declared word of God, following their logic at the expense of real truth,



and saving their consistency at the cost of hope and joy. We are liable to the same temptations, at the same expense. It is the mission of the church, as set by the ascending Lord, to preach the gospel to every creature — this gospel “that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them” (2 Cor. v. 19). We need not reconcile that gospel with theories or facts beyond our understanding, before we preach it in its fullness. We need not be too much concerned for our own consistency, or for the harmony of our convictions with those of our predecessors. The test of a true gospel is, after all, not whether there be no flaw in its reasoning, as it passes through the machinery of an ill-formed human mind, before it finds its way out of his lips; nor whether it is of so perfect shape that no human ingenuity can find fault with its symmetry; nor whether the possibility of finding difficulties and objections, either in the past or the future, has been obviated: but whether it does justice to a love which passeth knowledge, and opens up a view to a real new world in which righteousness shall dwell and love be triumphant. The test of the gospel is hope. “For we are saved by hope. But hope that is seen is not hope, for who hopeth for that which he seeth. But if we hope for that which we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.”

What are men, then, to do with their unsolvable problems? Leave them to the love of God, which is able to solve them. If they will give full scope to faith, they will find sometimes that the universal gospel of God's grace in Christ is a perfect theodicy. Let them give their attention to the beholding of God in the face of Jesus Christ, that they may know Him and learn to love Him. For “this is eternal life, to know God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.”

*Christian Van Der Veen.*

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN.

## EDITORIAL.

## THE TEACHING OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THAT OF THE APOSTLES.

THE church chiefly depends for its knowledge of Christianity upon two sources, the teaching of Jesus, and the teaching of his apostles.

It has other means of information, the Old Testament, and the record of its own enlarging life. The study of these is essential to complete knowledge of Christianity. The New Testament cannot be fully understood by a mind untaught in the Old Testament and in the history of the church. But these sources of knowledge are secondary to the two first mentioned. They do not lead to the heart and centre of the thing to be known. Indeed, the facts and principles upon which the intelligent use of them depends are contained in the New Testament, and they are therefore dependent upon it in a far deeper way than that in which it is dependent upon them. Their service extends only to expanding and illustrating the central and germinal ideas which the Christian Scriptures contain. The church must ever regard the teachings of Jesus and those of his apostles as the primal sources of all knowledge about the true religion; must always go back to these for an answer to the ever-recurring question, What is Christianity?

He who would use these two prime sources rightly has to ask which of them deserves precedence over the other as regards authority and value. Their mutual relation forces this question upon him. They are not contemporaneous. Nearly the lifetime of a generation separates them, (quite as much, indeed, if an average be struck), — a time crowded with the most momentous religious events. They are not coördinate. One source contains the teachings of the Founder of Christianity, the other those of his disciples, men who eagerly profess inferiority to their Master in knowledge as well as position. The themes with which they deal are not mutually exclusive. Each speaks from its own point of view of the true religion, the life which men may live in this world with and for God. The teaching is, in each case, greatly influenced as regards both form and substance by the historical conditions under which it was given, but in both cases it gives an answer to the fundamental question what right religion is.

Evidently, then, the student of Christianity has to find out the mutual relation of these two great sources of knowledge before using them. He cannot assume that they are coördinate and independent of each other without disregarding the plain facts of the case. One came from the Master, the other from the disciple; why shall not the one have the place belonging to the Master's utterances, the other that belonging to the disciple's? It may be said that between Jesus's speaking and the apostles' writing things took place which gave the teachings of the latter much of

its value. This is true; but it does not follow from this that their ideas are to be classed with those of their Master. They addressed different audiences, and spoke from different points of view. Jesus talked to Jews of a kingdom to be set up by Him. Paul wrote to Gentiles of a salvation which had been accomplished by Jesus. We have not to do here with two parts of a whole, but with two things that are diverse though akin, two conceptions of religion; and we who hold that the supreme Christian teaching lies in these two conceptions must ask which underlies and gives the measure to the other. Both are true; but as they are not independent, nor mutually exclusive, one must give authentication to the other and be its test.

To which belongs the higher, the supreme place?

There are some, of course, who believe that this question need not be asked; who see no better use of the teaching of Jesus and the apostolic teaching than that of breaking both into fragments and using those fragments in building a theological structure upon a frame supplied by philosophy. But this way of using Scripture is fast passing out of favor. Those who respect the integrity of inspired teaching have to ask which holds the higher place.

Some influential students of Christianity give the apostolic teaching the precedence. This necessarily follows, they think, from the fact that it is the first teaching given after Christianity was established in the world, and the first, therefore, which fully shows what it is. The death and resurrection of Jesus, and the Pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit are, it is said, the facts which chiefly made the Christian religion. Before these events, Christianity did not exist. Our best ideas of it must be obtained from those who knew it in its beginnings, namely, the apostles. The teaching of the Master could not, in the nature of the case, deal with those great things, the chief Christian events, which had not come into being when He taught. It is, therefore, perfect as it is in form, and flawless in excellence, as religious truth secondary to that contained in the apostolic writings. God's ways with men could not be revealed to the Jews by even his Incarnate Son, speaking as a man to men, as they were afterwards shown to Jews and Gentiles by his Spirit speaking through the apostles. It follows, it is said, that the apostolic ideas are the ultimate source of Christian knowledge. They lead one deeper into the heart of Christianity than even those of Jesus, which belong to and illustrate an earlier stage of divine revelation.

This opinion we believe to be contradicted by the very authority to which it gives the highest place, — the teaching of the apostles. The estimate put by them upon Jesus Christ, an estimate warranted by what He said about himself, implies that his religious ideas are not secondary to their own, or those of any men, but on the contrary hold the supreme place. Jesus Christ was to the apostles, as He has been to the whole church, the perfect revelation of God; the divine image or counterpart,

as St. Paul has it ; the Word incarnate, as St. John says. True, it was, according to Paul, by the resurrection that He became the Son of God in power ; but his resurrection, in the apostle's thought, involved no change in his being, it was only the flowering out of his perfect manhood. He was the " Lord from heaven," and therefore He rose from the dead. Paul held that in the earthly state Jesus was sinless, and that what He said then, for example, his instruction as regards the sacredness of marriage, or his prediction concerning his second coming, or his command to observe the Lord's Supper, holds his church to eternal obligation of faith and obedience.

This apostolic teaching about Jesus implies, we believe, the perfection of his religious consciousness, and its supreme authority for his church. If his person were a perfect revelation of God, then his religious ideas must have been absolutely true ideas.

A man may be unconsciously a medium of divine revelation. Inanimate nature reveals God. The body and mind of the Hottentot carry a larger revelation of Him. A good man in the higher operations of his spirit makes a yet fuller disclosure of his Maker. But the revelation of God which the apostles attribute to Christ is of another kind : a full disclosure of his life in its outgoing towards man, coming from conscious intimacy with Him ; the reflection of his being from the depths of the intelligence and the heart. Certainly Jesus professed to give such a revelation when He said, " No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him." These words contain a claim to possess and to impart a correct knowledge of God. They do not mean that the revelation promised is made solely by teaching. Jesus doubtless felt that his life taught men what God is. But it is implied that the revelation of God made in the life is seen by the speaker, seen by him more clearly than any one else. If Jesus, by his acts and sufferings, showed men truths about God which He did not see himself, then the assertion that He had a knowledge of the Father corresponding to the Father's knowledge of Him, and giving Him exclusive qualification to reveal God to men, must have been a mistaken one. The apostles lead and represent the church in saying that it was not in any degree erroneous ; that Jesus Christ was all that He believed and claimed himself to be.

It need hardly be said that the moral perfection ascribed to Him by all his disciples implies the justice of his estimate of himself, and accordingly of his ideas about God. He could not have been ideally perfect if He had been self-deceived as to the accuracy of his knowledge of the Father. To attribute absolute truth to Jesus's religious ideas is to believe that they take precedence of those of all other men, his apostles included. The special illumination given to some of his disciples did not raise them to equality with Him as teachers of divine truth, for it did not bring them to a place so close to God as that which He occupied.

The question now presents itself, Have we in the teaching attributed to Jesus by the Gospels a correct presentation of his religious ideas? Do we find in them his thoughts about those religious truths which He regarded essential and permanent? It is well to restrict the inquiry to the first three Gospels, since the fourth is believed by many interpreters, we think with reason, to report such of Jesus's sayings as it selects for presentation somewhat freely. The older biographies of Jesus give a faithful report of so much of his teaching as was stored in the memory of his disciples. The discussion concerning the age of these writings, carried on during the last half century, gives these results: that they were written before all the apostles died; that the earliest writing contained in them came from the hand of an apostle; and that one of them was written by a companion and relative of another apostle. Criticism has not impugned their report of Jesus's teaching in any important feature. The discourses and sayings which this report presents, by their unique individuality of thought and expression, bear witness to their own genuineness. The inquiry which the church has been forced to make into the historic basis of its faith has furnished it with good reason for believing that it knows what its Master taught.

Did what He taught express his belief about the essential truths of religion? It professed to do so. He described a kingdom of God to be set up by himself. The Hebrew religion was to culminate in it. It was to overspread the earth, and to endure until the end of time. He described the relation to God which the members of that kingdom would enjoy, and the mutual tie uniting them. So He showed what God would do with men, and what they could be with Him, and what to each other. Such teaching deals with the fundamental verities, if there are any. It professes to give the teacher's thought as to what they are.

It is sometimes said that we are to make allowance in our estimate of Jesus's teaching for the fact that He condescended to the dull and sluggish minds of his hearers. This is true. Our recollection of his condescension should make us ready to believe that He omitted some truths which his hearers were not ready to receive; that He contented himself with suggesting others instead of explicitly teaching them. But it does not suggest to us that He consciously taught half-truths. Our reverence for Him should make us think that He could not do this. We can easily believe, for example, that the religious exclusiveness in which his people had been educated would prevent Him from expressly saying that the kingdom of God belonged to Gentiles, as such, equally with Jews. It was wiser, and as truthful, to stop with teaching the universality of the kingdom, leaving events to show the way in which its universality was to be reached.

But we cannot believe that Jesus would say anything about God or man or life or duty that He knew to be one-sided, in the expectation that

it would by and by be replaced by fuller teaching. He would not have said that the Heavenly Father loves and is kind both to the evil and the good, if He had believed that the statement must be qualified in order to be fully true.

We are, therefore, to receive his teaching of religious truths as setting forth the image of those truths lying in his mind. Such dignity and authority as belong to Him belong to this teaching. We cannot regard Him as the Lord and Master of the church, and yet think that the words He spoke on earth are in any sense antiquated or outgrown. We may believe that at the resurrection He laid aside certain limitations which the condescension of the Incarnation imposed. The change was not — if we may reverently speak thus — like that which the chrysalis undergoes when it bursts into the butterfly. The risen Christ had no essential element of personality which did not belong to the earthly Christ. The spiritual conceptions which He gave to his disciples by his Spirit are not truer than those which He had and expressed here, for these last carry the truth of his perfect life.

The teaching of Jesus is, then, the higher of the two chief sources of Christian knowledge. That of the apostles is ancillary to it, and should have a subordinate place in determining what Christianity is. The church should find its fundamental and regulative ideas of religion in the teaching of its Master. It should construe the later revelation given by the apostles by the earlier given by the Lord himself. It should interpret those great events in his earthly career which followed his ministry by that teaching which, in explaining the kingdom of God, explained the life of Him its Founder.

We do not, of course, call in question the doctrine of the apostolic inspiration. We hold with the church catholic, that the apostles had a teaching gift, which made their works unique among Christian writings for value and authority. But "one star differeth from another star in glory," and in the firmament of revelation there is but one "bright and morning star."

We do not wish to be understood to say or imply that the apostolic teaching needs to be corrected in any of its important features by the teaching of Jesus. The variance between the disciples and the Master which some have found, we do not find. All that is essential in Paul's doctrine of justification, that part of his teaching which is most original and distinguishing, has its roots in the teaching of Jesus.

But we claim that the apostolic teaching is only rightly understood by the church when studied in connection with and subordination to the teaching of the Master. It is sometimes said that this teaching was only the expansion of the apostolic preaching of Jesus of Nazareth as the crucified and risen Messiah. But this shows defective knowledge of this preaching. It was not a bare statement of the leading events of Christ's career. It was a presentation, a fresh and glowing presentation of Him ;

the repetition of incidents in his life in their minute detail, and the impartation of the religious truths which He taught. The tradition embodied in our Gospels was the material of which the apostolic sermons were composed. Even Paul made some use of this tradition in his preaching. The ideas about Christ and Christianity contained in the apostolic letters are those of men who taught first and largely in their Master's words, adding words of their own to meet objections, or give counsel or comfort or explanation, as the needs of their converts required. They did not think of trying to replace that supreme teaching of which their minds and hearts were full by their own. In forbidding divorce Paul said, "Not I command, but the Lord." In predicting the second coming of the Master he began: "We say unto you in the word of the Master."

The Christian Church has never given due honor to Christ's doctrine of the kingdom of God. It has called De Wette's characterization of that doctrine as the perishable husks of Christian truth rationalistic, but it has acted as if the characterization were just. It has begun in constructing its conception of religion with the antithesis of sin and grace, or divine sovereignty, or some other abstract notion, and has gone on to completion, using the varied materials at its command, passing over this teaching of its Master; even allowing the one small place at first reserved for it to be usurped by the apostolic doctrine of the church. The doctrine of the kingdom should have had the fundamental and shaping place given it in the teaching of Jesus. This *is* Christianity, the thing which the church desires to know. It should be studied as it lies mirrored in the perfect Mind. The knowledge contributed by the apostles and that given in the later life and thought of the church should be made tributary to the task of understanding this comprehensive fact and truth. Thus really edifying knowledge will be gained, knowledge of living truths and truths in harmonious relation.

To know Christianity, we must be really, as well as nominally, disciples of Christ.

#### THE THEOLOGICAL RESTIVENESS OF ULTRA-CONSERVATIVES.

THE recent entrance of an Episcopal rector of eastern Massachusetts into the Roman Catholic Church has excited rather more than passing interest on account of the very singular reason he gives for taking the step. He goes, not because he is wavering, but because he is steadfast in the faith. He goes, not to find an answer to doubts, for he has no doubts; and not to find a place of rest for his troubled soul, for his soul is not troubled in respect to doctrine or duty. He goes because those about him are departing from the faith once delivered to the saints. There is so much liberalism and rationalism in the church with which he has been connected, and, indeed, in all the Protestant churches, that, as he is entirely out of sympathy with such tendencies, he must part company with



those who are rapidly becoming unsound and dangerous, and enter a communion where, as he believes, all things continue as they were from the very beginning. Such is the account given by an ultra-conservative of his restiveness, and of his reasons for seeking more congenial ecclesiastical associations.

While the course pursued is singular, the restiveness is typical. The most restive party in the various denominations is the party whose orthodoxy, in its own opinion, has been kept whole and undefiled, and is above suspicion by others. It has been supposed that unrest is confined to the liberals, who have been thought of as tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, as struggling painfully in the break-up of their old faiths, as torn asunder by conflicting opinions; and the conservatives, especially the ultra-conservatives, have been thought of as standing in places of security, as congratulating themselves on their immunity from disturbance, as occupying the position which Lucretius thought so enviable, on the hill of truth, from which they could look with complacency on the errors, and wanderings, and mists, and tempests, in the vale below. But, whatever unrest may accompany readjustment of one's beliefs in the light of increasing knowledge, there is also restiveness on the part of those who try to stand still while the world and the church are moving away from them. Indeed, signs are not wanting that the ultra-conservative party is at present more disturbed than any other. That party sympathizes with the complaints of the Cambridge rector concerning the rationalism of the church and clergy, and is as unhappy as he about it all. But, as nearly all of them hate Roman Catholicism as heartily as they hate liberalism, they have not his way of escape to a place of refuge where the ancient traditions are preserved unimpaired. It is not so long since these brethren were intimating that the advocates of a new theology should leave this or that denomination in which there was no room for them, but now, so rapidly do changes of sentiment occur in these last days, they are almost on the point of questioning whether there is a home for them in communions infected with rationalism, and have been actually known to take their turn in pleading for toleration of their opinions and methods. There need be no fear, however, of defection. They will remain with us, for their own good, and for the good of all, we may hope, if for no better reason, because there is no place of retreat occupied only by others like-minded with themselves.

The interest attaching to the state of mind of the ultra-conservatives pertains entirely to the causes of it, as indicating, by contrast, the character and direction of the stronger theological tendencies of the time. These causes are not far to seek.

One cause of restiveness is want of congeniality with living movements of thought in religion, philosophy, and science. The ultras are not, it is true, unaware of the reconstruction of opinion which has been going forward. They have enough knowledge of the change to know the new

thought when they see it. In fact, some of them are very keen in detecting the peculiar marks of liberalism. They perceive a flavor of rationalism before definite statements can be challenged. They are quick to catch the scent of heresy while as yet common Christians have no suspicion. They have even been so unfortunate, in some instances, as actually to be compared to hounds with highly trained sense of smell, sniffing the air and searching for the trail. But it is one thing to perceive that new opinions are different from the old, and quite another thing to understand the effects of enlarging knowledge and to feel the force of the current of life as it broadens and deepens its channel. The relation of ultra-conservatism to spiritual and progressive liberalism may be likened to the contact of two separate spheres, which only impinge on each other but do not interpenetrate. In a word, it may be said that the significance of the readjustment of beliefs is not understood by those who are merely restive in the midst of change. They do not see that the restatement of beliefs is the consequence of a more discriminating knowledge of the evolution of nature, of a more sympathetic insight into the complex relations of men in society, of a broader survey of the advances of history, and of a more real thought of the indwelling of God in nature, society, and history, guiding them, or rather shaping them all in the fulfillment of the perfect ideal of personal character and social life, according to the likeness and the kingdom of Jesus Christ. The outcome is judged by itself apart from the growths from which it proceeds, and is therefore misjudged. Such failure to understand is due to certain limitations of mind, if we may venture so to characterize some of our brethren, to a want of sympathy or congeniality with the life of thought and the life of the world. They demand definiteness in religious beliefs. They complain of the vagueness of liberalism. Lack of precision is, indeed, the first sign of error, referred to above as the flavor or the scent of heresy, detected before the error can be specifically formulated and proved. Minds which can be satisfied only with exactness of statement, with literal definition, with one and only one expression of faith, cannot understand beliefs which are expressed in various and changing forms. The literalists usually mean well. But what they gain in precision they are likely to lose in depth, and they certainly lose in appreciation of that which is most full of life and power. What they are most conscious of in the new is its reactionary effect, in the disturbance of the old which always accompanies progress. Impact of mutually exclusive spheres produces rebound, and the stationary sphere is chiefly aware of the rebound, while the moving sphere is aware of its own progress, which is not arrested by obstacles.

The restiveness of ultra-conservatives may be traced to another cause, which, however, is a result of this lack of appreciation. Restiveness is an accompaniment of a purely defensive attitude. The old is engaged in defending itself. The defense is carried on in some quarters

with great vigor, not always unmingled with bitterness. But it is the energy of mere self-preservation. The old orthodoxy is becoming tired of making concessions. It has abandoned the outworks, one after another, and now lies intrenched in the central fortress, in which it proposes to remain, and to fight, if need be, to the death. It will be admitted that such figures of defensive warfare are very naturally employed to describe the attitude of the old theology. Now, a defensive attitude is a restless attitude. There is no peace, and small hope for it. It means discouragement. The aggressive force may work as hard and suffer as much, but it is expectant and confident. True enough, the ultra-conservatives give their support to missionary enterprises, and are not wanting in many good works, but they are not directing the movements of progress, they are not representatives of coming beliefs, they are not teaching the world as it needs to be taught, they are not adapting their gospel to the conditions of thought and life which are really, although perhaps ignorantly, desiring it. They know very well that no reaction is to be expected in their favor. They must even shut their own eyes to facts in order to maintain their literal constructions of some portions of the Bible. They must form hypotheses more and more ingenious and unreal to meet forcible objections. They may believe most earnestly that new views are wrong and dangerous, and yet they cannot but be aware that their own views can be maintained only by doing violence to stubborn facts on the one hand, and to the principles of correct Biblical interpretation on the other hand. If they were as sure of their own beliefs as they claim to be, they would await with patience the day when those beliefs will gain general acceptance. But they know that day is never coming. At the most, they will defend their opinions stoutly, yielding the ground inch by inch, but they will not venture forth boldly on the positive work of guiding religious opinion and the energy of the modern church in the modern world.

We have mentioned lack of congeniality with living movements as a cause of restiveness. This spirit really betrays lack of faith. There is solicitude amounting almost to alarm for the future. There is a distrust of honest scholarship, and of honest science, and of honest philosophy, and, indeed, of everything, be it fact or theory, which threatens outgrown opinions. The ultra-conservatives present the strange anomaly of pessimistic Christians. They have no faith in the future, no faith in the younger generation, no faith in their sincere fellow-men, and therefore no cheerful, steadfast faith in God, who works out his increasing purpose through honest seekers after truth and righteousness in the successive generations. When pessimism is replacing faith, hope, and love, there must certainly be restiveness.

There is really a kind of absurdity in the estimates our ultra-conservative brethren have of their own religious philosophy, and of what they are pleased to call rationalism. The new theology might be considered

a *renaissance* of the more simple and original type of Christian belief, and as therefore discarding that defective metaphysic or rationalism which has for some time appropriated the name of orthodoxy. It is preposterous for the old orthodoxy, which is based on a bad metaphysic, sneeringly to call the new theology rationalism. The most marked characteristic of the new theology is that it seeks to know the exact facts of the life of Christ and the teaching of the apostles, through an accurate knowledge of the literary sources, and thus to be built on a science of Biblical theology, using the books of the Bible in the light of their actual composition and structure. It rejects a rationalistic treatment of the Bible which frames a theory of inspiration or inerrancy independently of the facts, a theory to which the ultra-conservatives cling, as if it had been sent down from heaven. The new theology is nearly silent about sovereignty, election, preterition, and other details of the eternal counsels of God, preferring rather to emphasize the redemption of God in Christ, and the universality of its purpose. But the ultra-conservatives, as the discussion in Presbyterian circles shows, have been rationalistic to the last degree in accepting a scheme of theology which has for its central principles metaphysical notions concerning the attributes and corresponding purposes of God. The old orthodoxy has accepted a doctrine of sin and guilt based on purely rationalistic conceptions of the human constitution, on unreal distinctions between nature and person, on metaphysical refinements between natural and moral ability, while the new theology, ignoring all such rationalizing, prefers to bring the power of redemption close upon the present power of sin, and the promise of renewal to every man through the freedom which is regained in Jesus Christ and exercised in penitence and trust. The restiveness of the ultra-conservatives is due in large part to the fact that they have vitiated the simplicity of Christianity with a false and impossible metaphysic, with a rationalism of the most virulent type, since it dishonors God and degrades man, with a self-contradictory philosophy, such as that which led John Wesley to say to one of its representatives, "Your God is my devil."

It is not, of course, literally true that ultra-conservatives are stationary. They are part of the stream of life, and have some motion, like the shallow water near the banks of a river. There are no mediæval theologians to-day. Some of the opinions of the hyper-orthodox would have been considered heretical a few centuries ago. But ultra-conservatives are alike in all ages in one respect. They are always reactionary. While they are chained to the chariot of progress, and must go along with it, they are the drag and not the wheel, and are always trying to get under the wheel, uphill as well as down.

Certain vagaries of belief which prevail somewhat at the present time are the offspring of ultra-conservative theology. The belief that Christ will soon come in visible form to accomplish by almightiness what has not been accomplished by the moral forces of redemption is a belief based on

the supposed inerrancy of all parts of the Bible, and on a depressing view of the depravity of mankind. It is strong in its opinion that the doctrine of election is true, and that the elect are soon to reign with Christ on earth. The attraction of the Roman Catholic Church in this country and in England is chiefly due to its conservative theology, which tolerates no departures from the ancient creeds. We do not affirm that ultra-conservatism logically leads to literalism and stagnation, but it certainly is congenial to such affinities, as a scholarly and liberal theology is not.

During the first year of the publication of this "Review," an editorial appeared in our columns entitled "The Accountability of the Ultra-Conservatives," in which we complained, with much feeling, that those thus designated were taking advantage of a position of great influence to place progressive theology in an unfavorable light. They were then aggressive and somewhat defiant. It is a hopeful sign of the growing influence of what we believe to be a sound, scholarly, and Biblical theology, that ultra-conservatism now commands interest rather for its restiveness as the living movements of thought leave it behind, than for the harm it may be accountable for by reason of its strength.

#### COLONEL GARDINER TUFTS.

WHAT has most commended the Massachusetts Reformatory has been hardly so much the fact of its being one of the two most admirable of all existing institutions for the care of criminals, but — to those who knew the man — the fact that Colonel Gardiner Tufts was in charge. Prison reform, like every other kind of reform, depends less upon contrivances than upon men. The character of the men who are now giving themselves to work in penal institutions marks more strongly than anything else the progress that is making in the treatment of crime. It is not long since the warden of a state prison was elected to the presidency of a college, but declined in order to undertake the direction of a new reformatory-prison.

Colonel Tufts shared with Mr. Z. R. Brockway, of the Elmira Reformatory, the main influence in the development of the reformatory idea, which is practically an American growth. Assuming charge of the Concord institution at the beginning of the experiment there, he was able to introduce nearly all the important features of the Elmira system, and to add some valuable original contributions. It was always his effort, in the administration of the reformatory, to have a close and constant acquaintance with all of its detailed workings. Every officer and every prisoner was kept feeling a sense of nearness to him. In a remarkable degree Colonel Tufts brought to the management of a prison the power of a great-hearted and noble manhood. It was this which in turn gave him so keen a sense of the humanity of the prisoners under his control. It gave him a faith in the reformatory idea which no

criticism of particulars could at all disturb. With a strong idealism, he supported his methods simply upon the principle that they were designed to meet the needs of the "prisoner-man." He would with beautiful simplicity avow his reliance upon this lofty motive for guidance in every slight detail of his work.

Colonel Tufts went about among the prisoners almost as a father among his boys. At the various meetings carried on by the prisoners, — which were his own special contribution to reformatory methods, — he would usually appear toward the close, and by invitation of the chairman, give words of friendly encouragement and counsel which made the prisoners, in spite of themselves, feel that here was some one of whose sympathy they were sure. The subordinate officers were constantly distrusted by the suspicious criminal mind, but Colonel Tufts commanded respect. His feeling for the young men under his charge was no mere philosophic philanthropy. He loved them. When the time came for one to be released, Colonel Tufts would walk with him out of the door and along the road, telling him in an honest and open way that there was a fresh opportunity before him in the world, and then would leave him with something like a blessing.

Colonel Tufts had been continuously in the service of the State of Massachusetts for thirty years. As to the manner in which he did his work, — whether as the representative of the State at Washington during the war, or the superintendent successively of the reform school at Monson, and of the reformatory prison at Concord, — one could give it a high estimate for his insight to comprehend a situation, and his strength to meet it. But this is not uncommon. It is perfectly safe to say that this long record of official position is, for uprightness and devotion to duty, spotless. It is better than that. One who in these days is looking for some of that old quality in men in the public service, of a fine, knightly sentiment of loyalty to country, touched with the love of man and the worship of God, will find that the life of Colonel Gardiner Tufts was radiant with it.

We may well believe that with the increase of the social sense, we shall be appreciating much more highly those forms of work for the people of the lower social grades, which have until now been given but little honor. The change will largely come about through the men who shall undertake such work and shall show the possibilities that lie about it. It is a far greater thing to be a prison superintendent, since Colonel Tufts has been one, than it ever was before. And it is a sufficient reply to all the larger objections that are urged against the reformatory idea, that the reformatory must be only one main centre for meeting the problem of the young criminal; that not his treatment under confinement must be the less hopeful and sympathetic, but his treatment in society at large, the more; that men of a like mind and heart with Colonel Tufts must, under public approval and support, care not only for those whom the

law brands as criminals, but for all those whose depressing surroundings and whose lack of the opportunities of life are, from the beginning, filling with the thoughts and feelings of crime.

#### SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY — THE ANDOVER HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

THE outward aspect of Christianity changes with each generation. This is one proof of its vitality. It means that the new form or shape comes from the adjustment of its activities to the needs of the world. The great signs of Christianity remain unchanged, its spirit, its essential doctrine, the sacraments, the general order of the church. The principles of service also remain unchanged. The heart of the true church holds the place to which Christ assigned it. "The disciple is not above his master, the servant is not above his lord." But the immediate objects of Christian thought and solicitude change, and the specific methods and agencies through which these objects are reached.

The term Social Christianity has come into recent use to represent that phase of Christian service which the present social situation in most Christian communities demands, and also the character of the new methods and agencies which are being employed to meet it. No one can overlook the fact that the emphasis in practical Christianity falls to-day upon the overcrowded centres of Christendom, as two or more generations ago it fell upon the unevangelized world. The only cry in our time which compares in intensity with that which caught the ear of Carey and Mills is the cry from the Christian cities. There are times when the providence of God enforces the commands of the New Testament with a startling literalism. At the beginning of the century, the voice of providence, speaking through an opening world, said to the church, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations." At the close of the century the voice of providence, speaking through the changed social conditions of the Christian peoples, is saying to the church, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor." The former command has not been withdrawn or made less urgent. The latter command has been added. Social Christianity represents the new duty which has been laid upon the church of loving one's neighbor. It is a very much greater duty than has as yet been acknowledged, partly because the neighbors of the church have mightily increased, and partly because loving one's neighbor means more than evangelizing him. We believe that the church is being aroused to the sense of the rapid increase of those to whom it owes neighborly care and consideration. But we believe that the church has not yet come to understand the nature and extent of its duty to those who have been brought near to it. We state, therefore, briefly what we conceive to be the principles of Social Christianity.

The first principle is that of personal identification through proper representatives of the church with those who need its help. This identi-



fication is best brought about by residence in the neighborhood to be reached. Work from without, however earnest, has its drawbacks. Residence gives more constant opportunities for knowledge and aid, and is in itself a constant influence. But resident work is greatly augmented if carried on through a group. One worker supports another. There is an enthusiasm from companionship in service. And the impression of an abundant use of personality is made upon the neighborhood. The Protestant Church has always been niggardly of men. Social Christianity requires a reform in this particular. Protestantism can never be a power among the masses until it is ready to diffuse its presence through all the neighborhoods of the cities. The group system, by which a number of men or women establish themselves at a given centre, and enter into personal relations with all within natural distance, is one form, and perhaps the best, of illustrating the large use of Christian personality.<sup>1</sup> And through the centre thus established the better life of the churches can naturally flow into the neglected neighborhoods. Persons of Christian purpose and culture, who really want to come into contact with their uncultured, poor, and suffering neighbors, can by this means have the opportunity of so doing. They can associate themselves as workers with those in residence. They can visit without intrusion. They can learn how to help others to help themselves. They can serve wisely, sympathetically, and therefore efficiently.

The second principle of Social Christianity is that Christianity shall be made to represent to the classes of barren and joyless life something of that which it represents to the average member of a Christian congregation. Christianity working through prosperous and cultured churches must work by a broad and varied ministry. It is a glaring inconsistency to offer to the destitute and estranged classes only one thing for which Christianity stands among those whose personal lives, homes, and work it has relieved, purified, and enriched. Let no one say that this is underestimating conversion. Christianity means that to the average Christian, plus a great many influences which control, educate, and refine. The inward life is continually reinforced, enlarged, and built up by helpful circumstances. Here is the moral power of the Christian home or school, of Christian companionship, of Christianized literature and art. Social Christianity acknowledges the fact that we "have need of all these things." It seeks to minister to the whole man, to every right and true instinct, and to all noble and generous desires. Its work is intensive as well as extensive. It asks how much can be brought to bear upon the individual in proper ways to make him larger, nobler, happier; not how little can be done and secure the final result in the saving of the soul. There is an insincerity in a great many so-called Christian "means," which the people detect and treat with a corresponding insincerity. If a

<sup>1</sup> See editorial in *The Nation* of December 17, 1891, on "The New Ministry to the Poor."

Christmas tree is spread to entrap a street boy into a Sunday-school, why should he not take the tree and "cut" the school. The whole thing is a game at which two can play. But if the thing done is worthy of doing for itself, and the boy so understands it, he will respond to it with a boy's heartiness and enthusiasm, a fact which has been abundantly proved by the success of boys' clubs. The spirit of Social Christianity gives sincerity to all the incidental and associated "means of grace" which the church employs, and adds its own comprehensive principle of making Christianity mean as much to every man as he is capable of receiving. It insists that Christian people shall share what Christianity really means to them.

The Andover House Association has been organized to carry out, in a modest but direct way, these principles of Social Christianity. The *appended documents* explain its origin and the proposed methods of its work. We will only add that its name represents the natural relation in which a theological seminary may put itself, through its practical and spiritual resources, to a city like Boston, and to neighboring communities like those in eastern Massachusetts. But the name covers an idea which invites the coöperation of those who have no personal interest in Andover Theological Seminary; and very many of these persons have generously responded to the purpose, and are members of the Association. The movement is undenominational, not inter-denominational. No effort is made to recognize or to ignore any denomination. The Association is open to all who believe in the idea as expressed in its articles. The Council is actually formed, by election of the Association, of persons from several of the religious communions.

The immediate work centres in Boston. The House is No. 6 Rolins Street, between Washington Street and Harrison Avenue, a few blocks south of Dover Street. The district or neighborhood includes the adjacent territory between Washington Street and Harrison Avenue, and along the piers toward the South Cove.

The Head of the House is Mr. Robert A. Woods, who, after graduating at Andover, spent a year in special investigation and work in London, and gave on his return a course of lectures at the Seminary, which have been recently published by Scribner under the title of "Social Movements in England." Several others from different sources will go into residence with him. The House will be open in January. The early work will be that of social analysis of the neighborhood, to ascertain its exact condition and all the resources and agencies which are already at hand. Then the work will be begun which the neighborhood seems to demand. The purpose is well defined, but there is no programme laid out. The aim will be adaptation to the wants and needs of the people.

Connected with the work at the House is that of the Extension Committee. It is hoped that work of a like nature may be instigated in other

adjacent communities, or that work already begun may be aided. The Association is intended to reach beyond the House in its plans, making that the centre of more general activities under the methods of Social Christianity.

The expenses of the House for the first year are to be met by membership fees. But as the work enlarges reliance must be placed upon the contributions of all who are interested in the objects of the Association. And an endowment fund for establishing the House and its work upon a permanent basis will be started at once. The financial interest of our friends in any part of the country is invited. Contributions for work or for the endowment fund may be sent to Colonel C. A. Hopkins, Treasurer, 95 Milk Street, Boston.

#### APPENDIX.

The following personal letter was sent out to bring together those who would naturally be interested in the establishment of an Andover House. A large number responded to the call, and at a subsequent meeting the Articles of Association were adopted, and members of the Council chosen: —

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *October 9, 1891.*

MY DEAR SIR, — It has long been my desire, in common with many of the alumni and friends of the Seminary, to see the establishment in Boston of an Andover House, devoted to the special ends of Social Christianity; and I am assured that the object has commended itself to others, both ministers and laymen, who are not directly identified with Andover, but who generously recognize the fact that such a work falls within her province.

The time has now come when the Seminary is reasonably prepared to undertake the work which the proposed House would represent. For several years increasing attention has been given to the philosophical and practical study of the Social Economy, so far as it lies adjacent to the church. Scholarships have been provided for the investigation, in the field, of questions pertaining to the administration of charities, the treatment of crime and of criminals, the relation of workingmen and of labor organizations to corporations and the State, and kindred subjects. The Winkley Lectureship, the chief Lectureship of the Seminary, has been frequently assigned to topics in Sociology. Alumni Lectureships have been instituted for the same purpose, from which, as one result, two valuable books have been gained: "*Modern Cities*," by Mr. Loomis, and "*English Social Movements*" (in press — Scribners), by Mr. Woods. And within the last two years the department of Social Economics has been organized, and full courses of Lectures are now regularly given in the Seminary curriculum upon Social Structure, with special reference to the Family, the Social Evolution of Labor, Pauperism, and Crime. And it should be added, that much valuable aid is given by several of the other departments through the attention which is directed by them to social questions.

The Seminary is thus prepared to furnish, from year to year, an assured number of graduates equipped for the precise work which the Andover House would carry on. And it is peculiarly fortunate in being able, as the scheme

is inaugurated, to put at the head of the House Mr. Robert A. Woods, who, with this in view, spent a large part of last year in residence at Toynbee Hall.

The Andover House is designed to stand for the single idea of *resident study* and work in the neighborhood where it may be located, — a neighborhood of social destitution and want. The House will be the home where men who can devote the whole or part of each day to such study and work will live. Personal identification with the lives of those who need help is the characteristic of the movement: to establish personal connection at every possible point, to encourage, teach, organize for mutual support, bring classes together, create some real sense of brotherhood, and in every way work from *within* the community for its social development. The whole aim and motive is religious, but the method is educational rather than evangelistic. It is not a repetition of the work of the churches.

A second, though hardly secondary, object of the Andover House will be to create a centre, for those within reach, of social study, discussion, and organization. Arrangements will be made at the House for lectures and courses of lectures on social topics at such times as may suit the convenience of members of the Andover House Association, — probably on Mondays at twelve o'clock. These lectures will be accompanied by practical discussions, and a prominent feature will be the report of experiments which are being made by the members, or by others, in different communities, both city and country. It is not intended that social study shall be limited to city populations. The population of country towns is quite as much in need of careful social analysis as that of the city. It is also hoped that the Andover House in Boston may lead to the establishment of branches, or of independent social clubs, in the neighboring communities. Eastern Massachusetts, from its large and increasing number of trade and manufacturing towns, offers an unusual field for the successful application of the principles and interests of Social Christianity.

The Andover House Association will be a legal organization, capable of holding property and of directing its own affairs. Plans for the working of the organization will be submitted at the proposed meeting for acceptance or modification. Annual membership fees (to be determined by the members) will be supplemented by special contributions for the actual work attempted. It is expected that the cost of running the House for the first year will not exceed \$2,000, including \$800 for rental. The men who occupy the House will have their rent free, but will otherwise live at their own charges, or will be supported by fellowships provided for the purpose. And as the work at first proposed is personal rather than institutional, the expense will be relatively light.

This circular letter is sent primarily to the younger alumni of the Seminary, who are familiar with its present methods of social study, but it is also sent with equal heartiness to others who have been thought to be personally interested in the end set forth.

All who receive this letter, and sympathize with its purpose, are cordially asked to invite others to attend with them the first meeting for organization, which, by the kindness of Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, will be held in the Lecture Room or "Hall" of the Columbus Avenue Church, on Monday, October 19, at twelve o'clock.

I trust that as many as can find it convenient will be present at this meeting.

I am, very sincerely yours,

WM. J. TUCKER.

## THE ANDOVER HOUSE ASSOCIATION.

## ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION.

ARTICLE I. This Association shall be called the Andover House Association.

ART. II. The objects of the Association shall be

(a) To establish and maintain a House in Boston as a residence for seminary and college graduates and others engaged in work for the social and moral elevation of the people in its vicinity.

(b) To bring into friendly and helpful relations with one another the people of the neighborhood in which the House is situated.

(c) To coöperate with churches, with charitable and labor organizations, and with other agencies acting for the improvement of social conditions.

(d) To serve as a medium between the different social elements of the city for bringing about a more intelligent and systematic understanding of their mutual obligations.

(e) To encourage efforts in other communities which may be similar in any degree, and to advance in general the cause of Social Christianity.

ART. III. The motive of this Association is distinctly religious, and its endeavor will be to express this motive in a way most suitable to the circumstances throughout all the work that it shall undertake.

ART. IV. The membership of this Association shall consist of persons in sympathy with the objects herein stated. Persons may be received into membership at any time, subject to the approval of the Council. Members shall contribute to the funds the sum of three dollars per year, the amount to be due on the first day of January of each year.

ART. V. The administration of the affairs of the Association shall rest with a Council composed of twelve members, to be elected by the Association, four to retire each year unless reelected; together with a Secretary, a Treasurer, and a Head of the House, to be elected each year by the Association, and the Professor of Pastoral Theology in Andover Theological Seminary, *ex officio*. The Council shall have the power of prescribing the by-laws and rules under which the work of the Association is carried on. It shall have the direction of all committees, and shall make an annual report of the whole work to the Association.

ART. VI. The Council shall choose from its own members two committees, the Finance Committee and the Executive. The Finance Committee shall have the care of the collection and expenditure of money. The Executive Committee shall lay out the plans of work, and shall provide for their fulfillment. Matters involving expense shall be subject to conference between the two committees, and both shall report to the Council. Other committees may be appointed at the will of the Council, unless otherwise ordered by the Association.

ART. VII. The Head of the House shall have the immediate superintendence of all the work of the House. Men offering themselves as residents of the House must be approved by the Council. They must be qualified for the work by previous training, and must offer themselves for not less than six months' actual service. They must specify the proportion of their time which they will be able to give to the work. Duly elected residents shall have their rooms in the House without charge.

ART. VIII. Besides residents, others, either men or women, may be enrolled as associate workers for such service as may be provided for them.

ART. IX. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association in May or June, at the discretion of the Council. At this meeting full reports of the work shall be made. Special meetings of the Association may be held at the call of the Council. Twenty-five members shall constitute a quorum. The chairman of the Council shall preside at the meetings of the Association, or, in his absence, some one of their own number selected by the Council.

ART. X. Amendments may be made to these Articles by a two thirds majority of the members of the Association voting at any annual meeting. Notice of amendments must be filed with the Secretary at least one month in advance, to be transmitted by him to the members previous to the meeting.

#### OFFICERS AND COUNCIL.

##### *Chairman of Council.*

PROFESSOR WILLIAM J. TUCKER, Andover.

##### *Secretary.*

MR. EDWARD H. CHANDLER, 144 Chandler Street, Boston.

##### *Treasurer.*

COLONEL C. A. HOPKINS, 95 Milk Street, Boston.

##### *Head of the House.*

MR. ROBERT A. WOODS, Andover.

##### *Other Members of Council.*

MR. C. W. BIRTWELL.

MR. H. H. PROCTOR.

REV. NEHEMIAH BOYNTON.

REV. W. D. ROBERTS.

REV. HOWARD A. BRIDGMAN.

REV. J. H. ROSS.

REV. C. A. DICKINSON.

MR. FRANCIS B. SEARS.

MR. WALTER B. MOSMAN.

REV. JOHN TUNIS.

REV. PHILIP S. MOXOM.

REV. WILLIAM E. WOLCOTT.

---

## BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

### PAUL'S RABBINIC EDUCATION.

HERO worship, common to all mankind, is not wholly absent in the Christian Church. Apocryphal Gospels tried to envelop Christ's cradle and childhood in a misty, mythical halo; apocryphal Apostolic Acts sought to supplement the meagre records we have of the first sacred college of Christendom. These are the products of the early centuries of our era; while the Middle Ages left us the legendary legacy of the "Acta Sanctorum." But even in modern times, when we would fain get along with as few miracles as are absolutely necessary for a supernatural religion, we are still inclined to look upon the first preachers of the gospel as prodigies. On the one hand, we like to talk of a band of illiterate, ignorant fishermen revolutionizing the world; on the other, we

extol Saul of Tarsus as the most learned and eloquent man of his times. Historical criticism has indeed done much to curb our claims to classic erudition for the Gentile apostle. We are beginning to be satisfied with Pauline doctrine, notwithstanding that his references to Greek poets are few, and probably picked up in the streets, rather than the schools, of cultured Tarsus. But it is yet generally maintained that he had enjoyed a thorough *Jewish* education; that, although a Hellenist by birth, he was a Talmudist by training. Even Renan, who is not over enthusiastic over the apostle's attainments, says, "It is in the Talmud . . . that the analogies of his ideas must be sought."<sup>1</sup> Some, less critical, would even make him a member of the Sanhedrim. But even if his youth<sup>2</sup> was against his obtaining a seat in the highest Jewish tribunal, — a privilege accorded only to *elders*, — it is still confidently claimed that he was at least an accomplished Rabbinit.

The principal texts upon which this claim rests are, in the first place, two passages in Acts (xxii. 3; xxvi. 5), in both of which the author represents Paul as referring to his early life spent at Jerusalem, and asserting to have been brought up in the strictest form of Pharisaism. In the first passage (Acts xxii. 3), there is the additional statement that he received this fanatical instruction "at the feet of Gamaliel." It is worthy of note that the explicit *name* of Paul's teacher occurs *only* here; whereas we might expect it in his defense before Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 5), and also in Acts xxiii. 6, where he tries to win over the Pharisees by exclaiming, "I am a Pharisee, son of a Pharisee," etc. Surely no recommendation could be stronger to such men than the claim to be a disciple of the illustrious and universally honored Gamaliel. It might equally be expected that Paul would mention it in Philippians iii. 5, where he enumerates *all* his early Jewish advantages. This brings us, in the second place, to the two passages in Paul's own writings (Gal. i. 13 sq.; Phil. iii. 5), where the apostle emphasizes the thorough and extraordinary change of his life, from a zealous persecutor to an earnest promulgator of the new faith.

Since the Epistles are, from a critical point of view, more valuable than the Acts on questions relating to Paul himself, we will examine the last two passages first. They read as follows: "For ye have heard of my manner of life in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and made havock of it: and I advanced in the Jews' religion beyond many of mine own age among my countrymen, being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of my fathers." (Gal. i. 13 sq.) And in Philippians (iii. 5), Paul tries to show that if anybody has reason "to have confidence in the flesh," *he* has "yet more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church," etc. Now, all that is said here is that he was extremely devoted to Judaism. In Galatians he does not even mention the word Pharisee: he simply surpassed others, of his age and race, in "*being more zealous*" for the *national traditions*. For notice, he does not say, "the tradition of the (τῶν) fathers," — which might, perhaps, have been construed as referring technically to the מסורת האבות — but "of *my* (μὴν) fathers," which means simply *my progenitors*. In Philippians he claims indeed to be a Pharisee; but it refers exclusively to his *mode of life*, — his piety and zeal, — *not* to his

<sup>1</sup> *Les Apôtres*, x.<sup>2</sup> Acts vii. 58.



education. This is also what Paul is reported by the writer of Acts to have emphasized in his famous defense before King Agrippa: "My manner of life know all the Jews . . . how that after the strictest sect of our religion I lived a Pharisee." Hausrath expresses it exactly, when he says: "The prejudices of the Pharisaic home surrounded his cradle; his Judaism grew like the mustard tree in the Gospel, and intolerance, fanaticism, national hatred and pride, and other passions built their nests among its branches."

It is only in Acts xxii. 3, as alluded to before, that his connection with Gamaliel is mentioned; and it is significant to notice that, if we only leave out the few words, "at the feet of Gamaliel," this passage also is perfectly consonant with the statements everywhere else: all he says is, "I am a Jew (born in Tarsus, but brought up here), instructed (not in the law of the Fathers, but) according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers, being zealous for God, even as ye all are this day." The emphasis being clearly on the fact that he was as good a Jew as any of them. Surely it would be absurd to suppose that the entire crowd that heard him were learned Pharisees, doctors of the law!

Right here let me mention two facts which, though often overlooked by critics, are of prime importance, not merely to a fair consideration of the subject in hand, but also to the understanding of scores of other New Testament passages, namely: —

1. The Pharisees were a *party*, not a sect or *school*, and the most popular party at that. As Josephus expresses it: "The Pharisees have the multitude on their side."<sup>1</sup>

2. The party as such was *liberal*, as it was democratic; but a small sect within the party (called *zealots*, *קנאים* — a sort of Know-Nothings), and as a rule recruited not from the cultured class, though, of course, not wanting some great leaders — was bigoted, fanatical, and "exceedingly zealous" for Judaism. This will be elaborately shown later on.

Now these two statements suggest two questions concerning Paul: (a) Was he a *learned* Pharisee, or simply one of the "multitude" belonging to the party? (b) Was he a *liberal*, or average, Pharisee; or did he belong to the *Zealots*?

Before attempting to answer these questions, we must mention some *a priori* considerations, corroborating the general opinion that Paul was an educated Hebrew. These may be briefly stated as follows: (1) Paul was a *thinker*, in many respects very profound, original, and independent; hence, if he was a Pharisee at all, he must have been a *thinking* Pharisee — a scholar; (2) he was also an *author*, which would naturally place him among the *Literati* of his day and nation; (3) he was, moreover, well versed in the Old Testament, which was the special characteristic of the Rabbins.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Antt.* XIII. x. 6; cf. also XVIII. i. 3: "On account of their doctrines, they (the Pharisees) are able greatly to persuade the *body of the people*, and whatever they (the people) do about divine worship, prayers and sacrifices, they perform them according to their (Pharisees') instructions;" again (XIII. x. 5): "These (Pharisees) have so great a power over the *multitude*, that when they say anything against the king or the high priest, they are presently believed." See also XIII. xvi. 1: "Alexandra (wife of Alex. Jannæus, who ruled after him) . . . put all things into their (Pharisees') power."

<sup>2</sup> So Josephus: "They (Pharisees) are supposed to excel others in the accurate knowledge of the laws of their country." (*Vita*, 38.)

Another line of argument, pursued by critics, is what may be termed the *internal evidence*, afforded by the Epistles. It is claimed quite generally that in style and thought Paul resembles the Talmudic writers, and that he acquired these "at the feet of Gamaliel." Thus, for instance, De Pressensé says, "Saul of Tarsus embraced the teachings of his illustrious master with characteristic earnestness and ardor. . . . At the feet of Gamaliel, he became practiced in those skillful dialectics which were the pride of the Rabbinic schools."<sup>1</sup> This writer, it may be remarked, believes also in Paul's "*familiarity* with the Greek poets," quoting the celebrated *three* passages. The more judicious and cautious Meyer puts it as follows: "His (Paul's) epistles exhibit, in the mode in which they unfold their teaching, a *more or less* distinct Rabbinico-didactic impress."<sup>2</sup>

At this stage of our discussion, we must enter to some extent into details, even at the risk of becoming somewhat *technical*, since the value of the argument can only be appreciated by an actual examination of some of the passages in Paul's writings which remind us more or less forcibly of the Talmud. We will examine these passages, for the sake of convenience, under two main heads:—

I. *General traits of style*, common to Paul and the Rabbins. Here we notice

(a) Paul's use of *allegory* in interpreting the Old Testament, as seen in (1) Hagar and Sarah standing for the two covenants (Gal. iv. 22–31); (2) the threshing ox representing human laborers (1 Cor. ix. 9 sq.);<sup>3</sup> (3) Moses' veil typifying the Jewish system (2 Cor. iii. 13–18). It is hardly possible or necessary to quote examples of allegorizing in the Rabbinic literature: any one consulting the *Midrash* on the Song of Songs alone, will find more allegory than any sober mind can hold.

(b) Paul's fondness of *paronomasia*, or play on words, for a very exhaustive and well classified list of which we would refer the reader to Canon Farrar's "Life of St. Paul."<sup>4</sup> The following aphorisms from the Talmud contain *in the original* words, sounding alike, but of entirely different meanings: (These words are indicated in the *translation* here by *italics*) (1) "If one is a *sportsman*, he cannot be a *scribe*" (Avod. Zara, 12); (2) "either *friendship*, or *death*" (Ta'anith, 23); (3) "woe is me because of my *passion* and my *creator* [being in antagonism]" (Berach., 58); (4) "a man betrays his character in three things: in his *purse*, in his *cup*, in his *anger*" (Erub., 65; Yoma, 22). Literally hundreds of such cases might be quoted; but these few specimens illustrate the point.

(c) Paul's arbitrary use of Old Testament texts, interpreting them without any regard to their *historic connection*, is apparent even to a casual reader, and the examples are too numerous to be mentioned here. Whether this trait is also borrowed from the Rabbins, as is claimed, will be discussed later. I will give, however, a specimen of Talmudic exegesis which has some points of similarity to passages in the Pauline

<sup>1</sup> *Early Years of the Christian Church*, Bk. I. c. 3, § 1.

<sup>2</sup> *Commentary on Rom.*, Introduction, § 1.

<sup>3</sup> The use made in the Talmud (Bava Mezia, 88) of the same Old Testament text (Deut. xxv. 4) cannot be called an *allegory*. It is an argument *a minore ad majus*, as will be shown further on. Yet there can hardly be any doubt that the apostle got the *basis* of his statement from a current Rabbinic interpretation; using it, however, with characteristic freedom.

<sup>4</sup> Vol. I., *Excursus*, II. pp. 628 sqq.

Epistles. In *Bava Bathra* (10 b), we have the following interpretation (or *misinterpretation*, rather) of Proverbs xiv. 34. The text is best rendered as follows: "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." Now, R. Eleazar says: "Righteousness exalts a nation (that means *Israel*); but the goodness of (other) nations is sin (being due to their self-exaltation)." The arbitrary assumption that the first word for nation refers to *Jew*, and the second to *Gentile*, reminds us of Rom. ix. 24-26 (where Hos. ii. 23 is similarly interpreted to refer partly to Gentiles and partly to Jews); while the mistranslation,<sup>1</sup> and the strange interpolation of the text to make a point recall the passage in Rom. x. 6-8 (treating Deut. xxx. 12 *sq.* in like manner).

II. *Specific statements and thoughts*, found in the Epistles, which were the product of the *Haggadists*. Not to dwell on 2 Tim. iii. 8, where Paul speaks of two Egyptian magicians by name, *Jannes* and *Jambres*, which must have been a current tradition of his day, though I do not recollect it to be in the *Midrashim*; and to pass such remote references as 2 Cor. xii. 2, "a third heaven," and Eph. iv. 10, "far above all the heavens," which seem to imply the Rabbinic division of seven heavens; and not to lay too much stress on Eph. ii. 14, "Christ is our peace," although the Messiah is often called שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ in the Talmud;<sup>2</sup> — we turn to more substantial and direct references. Such are

(a) 1 Cor. x. 4 speaks of the "rock in the wilderness that followed Israel." To my mind, there can be no doubt that Paul had in mind the *Midrash*, incorporated even in Onkelos' Version,<sup>3</sup> that the rock rolled along behind the camp, as a constant supply of water.<sup>4</sup>

(b) In 1 Cor. xv. 52, where the general resurrection is associated with the last trump, and in 1 Thes. iv. 16, where, in addition to the trumpet, we have also the Archangel descending from heaven with God, we cannot fail to find the recurrent presentation of the Talmud that God, or the Archangel Michael, will blow the trumpet seven times, the last of which will be the signal for the dead to rise.

(c) Gal. iii. 19 evidently refers to the tradition of angels handing down the law at Sinai.

(d) Satan is often termed "the prince of the power of the air,"<sup>5</sup> which is again a very common designation of the *Aggaddoth*.

(e) 2 Cor. ii. 16 is almost a verbatim translation of a common saying among the Rabbins as regards the Law, "If a man is pure, it becomes for him a medicine of life; but if he is not pure, it becomes for him a medicine of death."

(f) The somewhat obscure passage of 1 Cor. xi. 10, a woman ought to have authority (= a veil) on her head, because of the angels, probably contains references to the Rabbinic statements (1) that "hair (uncovered) is very immodest in a woman;" (2) that "angels brood over places of prayer;" and (3) that "angels are apt to fall in love with the daughters of man."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is not strictly mistranslated: the words may mean that; but it is an utter disregard of the parallelism; nor is a *Wisdom* author likely to draw any such national distinctions.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Meyer, *in loco*, where he shows that the Rabbinic use is not the same.

<sup>3</sup> Num. xxi. 19, in *Targum*.

<sup>4</sup> Meyer does not admit this; but the words in the text are meaningless, if the tradition is not referred to.

<sup>5</sup> Cf., for example, Eph. ii. 2; vi. 12 *et alia*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Gen. vi. 2, and *Rashi*.

To sum up, then, all the arguments that can be advanced in favor of Paul's Rabbinic education, we have (1) the fact that he was a literary man; (2) the general similarity in the style of Paul and the Rabbins; (3) particular thoughts and ideas which only come from the Talmudic literature. I have worked out all these lines of argument with greater care and in fuller detail than any critic has ever done before, because I am perfectly willing to concede that such parallels of thought and expression do indicate a direct dependence between the great apostle and the teachings of the Pharisaic scholars of his day. But do they in the least necessitate the supposition that he *himself* was such a scholar? Does any one claim such learning for the visionary son of Zebedee? Still the Apocalypse contains by far more Rabbinic conceptions than all of Paul's letters put together. Nobody looks for such an education in the Alexandrian author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; and yet there is to be found more Rabbinism in it than in any Pauline Epistle of equal length. In an unpublished article on "Jesus and the Pharisees," I have pointed out numerous parallelisms, very often *verbal*, between Christ's sayings and those of eminent Rabbis of his time; still the unanimous verdict of critics is that the Son of Man attended no Rabbinical Colleges, and I am persuaded they are right. It will be seen, therefore, that the above arguments would place Saul of Tarsus on the same level as, and not higher than, any other New Testament writer; and that the claim advanced in favor of a thorough Talmudic training in his case rests ultimately and exclusively on the *single* statement in Acts (xxii. 3). Once question the correctness of Luke's words that Saul was instructed "at the feet of Gamaliel," and no one would or could find any greater display of Rabbinic lore in the tent-maker of Tarsus than in the fishermen of Galilee.

The question now arises, Do we have any good grounds for doubting the authenticity of Luke's remark? I will name the following five:<sup>1</sup>—

(1) It occurs only *once* in Acts, and *nowhere* in the Epistles. This has already been noticed; but let me emphasize its significance: if Paul could truly claim to have been a disciple of Gamaliel, he would never have omitted it, whenever he referred to his past life. No statement could establish his former Judaism and Pharisaism more firmly than this; no better passport of orthodoxy could be produced in any country where Judaism was at all known.

(2) Paul is nowhere mentioned in the Talmud, whereas Peter, James, and John are. Now, if the Rabbins found it desirable to discuss questions of theology with these untutored Galilean heretics,<sup>2</sup> surely they would not pass unnoticed such a renegade as Saul, if they knew anything about him. The fact must be that in Jerusalem he was very obscure, while out of it he never came in contact or conflict with the *Schoolmen*.

(3) Saul got his letters of recommendation to Damascus from the *High-Priest*. Why not from Gamaliel, who was the President of the Sanhedrim, and the Prince (נָשִׂיא) of Israel? This becomes stranger still, when we remember that the high-priest at this time (37-42 A. D.) was Theophilus, son of Hanan, who was an *unlawful* usurper, from the Jewish point of view, since he received the office from the Roman General Vitellius, who deprived the *hereditary* and rightful priest to make

<sup>1</sup> The first and last of these were noticed by critics, Hausrath and Renan.

<sup>2</sup> They are invariably called חֲסִידִים (= heretics).

room for his favorite.<sup>1</sup> That Theophilus was disliked by the Jews can be seen from the fact that he was deposed again as soon as Agrippa received the kingdom.<sup>2</sup> Surely such a man would be an object of holy disgust to a "Pharisee of the Pharisees." Besides, the authority of the high-priest outside of Jerusalem amounted almost to nothing;<sup>3</sup> while Gamaliel, we are told, exercised jurisdiction wherever Jews were found,<sup>4</sup> and held the supreme authority of the Sanhedrim more effectively than any other president before or after him.<sup>5</sup> An illustrious pupil of his would certainly not go to an illegitimate, despised high-priest for letters to the Synagogue at Damascus.

(4) Paul's use of Old Testament quotations, one of the strongest proofs used by critics to establish his connection with Rabbinism, shows the very opposite when closely considered:

(a) Mostly Paul quotes from the *Septuagint*, which found currency only among the *Hellenists*, but was treated with contempt almost by the Hebraists. All quotations in the Talmud are from the Hebrew text.

(b) Whenever he differs from the LXX., he seems to cite some Targumic paraphrase which he heard in the Synagogue readings. Now, the first thing that any Rabbinic scholar learned was to quote the Old Testament with scrupulous accuracy, since the whole point of a novel interpretation often turned on a *single letter*.

(c) Paul utterly disregards the *natural* sense of a passage when he has a point to make; while it was a settled canon of hermeneutics with the Talmudists that "no scripture passes out of its plain meaning,"<sup>6</sup> Whatever extravagant notion they got out of the text, or put into it, they always recognized it as a *secondary* interpretation, or mere inference, holding that the word of God had a simple sense, intended for all, and a deeper significance, which only the learned could discern. Take as a single instance the passage already referred to in Deut. xxv. 4, and note the essential difference in its treatment between the Rabbins and Paul. It reads, "Thou shalt not muzzle an ox while he thresheth." Now, the Talmud (Bava Mezia, 88) says very appropriately, If God has compassion for a brute, how much more ought we to treat a human laborer kindly.<sup>7</sup> In other words, there is no attempt made to deny that the text refers to an ox, and nothing else; but *inferentially*, *a fortiori*, the principle is extended to human beings. But how is it with Paul? He totally denies that the text ever meant an ox at all. He says in 1 Cor. ix. 9 *sq.*, "Doth God take care for oxen? Or saith he it *altogether* for our sakes? For our sakes, *no doubt*, this is written."

(5) Saul of Tarsus could never have been a disciple of Gamaliel, and at the same time so extremely intolerant. Gamaliel was calm, considerate, liberal; Saul was the very opposite. Attempts have been made to efface the difficulty in two ways:—

<sup>1</sup> Jos., *Antt.* XVIII. v. 3.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, XIX. vi. 2.

<sup>3</sup> The Jews of the *Diaspora* cared little, if anything, for the Temple and Priesthood at Jerusalem. In Egypt they even built a temple of their own, as is well known.

<sup>4</sup> Sanhed., *Tosiphta*, c. 11; *Jerus.*, Sanhed. 18 a.

<sup>5</sup> *Mishna*, Edujoth, VII. 7; Sanhed. II. 6.

<sup>6</sup> מִן פִּשְׁתֵּי מִדֵּי פִשְׁתֵּי

<sup>7</sup> Cf. the words of Jesus, as given in Matt. vi. 26, "Are ye not much better than they?"

(a) Gamaliel was *not* tolerant. Of course, this necessitates a perversion of the natural impression left by the account given of him in Acts v. 34-39. But even if this passage could be explained away, *all* that we know of this distinguished Jewish Rabbi points unequivocally to largeness of mind and heart. Scholarly in his habits, refined in taste, cultured in Greek letters and thought — a study bitterly denounced by the narrow Zealots — such was Gamaliel. He was not too strict in the observance of the Sabbath,<sup>1</sup> a point zealously guarded by the extreme Judaistic party, as can be seen from the fact that most of the attacks made on our Lord were because of his laxity in observing the Sabbath. He treated with equal liberality and tenderness all the poor, suffering, or dead, whether heathen or Hebrew.<sup>2</sup> Truly remarks the distinguished Dr. Ginsburg, "This (liberality) contrasts very strikingly with the conduct of Christians towards Jews, and towards each other, even at the present day."<sup>3</sup> Surely Saul's "breathing threatening and slaughter" was not derived from the atmosphere of Gamaliel's school-room.

(b) The second expedient resorted to is that "Gamaliel I., like his grandfather Hillel, held the somewhat *anomalous* position of a liberal Pharisee."<sup>4</sup> In other words, while Gamaliel was liberal enough *personally* and privately, the teachings of his school and party were bigoted. If this could be established, the difficulty would indeed disappear: since Saul would be no exception to the many other disciples of the "House of Hillel." But the liberality of this school is proverbial. It is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss the origin and progress of Pharisaism, its schools and sects, its teachings and tenets, its plans and purposes. Suffice it here to state that the popular notions about the narrowness, intolerance, and fanaticism of the Pharisees are due either to the malicious misrepresentations of anti-Semites, like Eisenmenger, Stöcker & Co., or to the innocent ignorance of those who accept them. The following well-known facts speak for themselves:<sup>5</sup> (1) Shamai, a colleague of Hillel, dissatisfied with the latter's liberality on questions of doctrine, organized a stricter school; but the Talmud declares that "in all cases where the two schools disagreed, the opinion of 'Hillel's House' became a law," giving as a reason "because the Hillelites were so meek and impartial as always to state the opinion of their opponents first." The party indorsed the liberal school. (2) The most numerous, and those who subsequently proved the most illustrious, scholars flocked to the lecture-rooms of the House of Hillel. Theological students then, as now, did not care for *ultra*-orthodoxy. (3) When the liberal Gamaliel died, the Talmud declares that everybody said mournfully, "the glory of the Law ceased," etc.<sup>6</sup> Canon Farrar strangely enough uses this as showing that Gamaliel was, after all, a *rigid zealot* of the Law.<sup>7</sup> Evidently the learned Canon forgot his other statement, quoted above, that Gamaliel was *anomalously* liberal. Why not rather interpret this

<sup>1</sup> Erubin, 45 a.

<sup>2</sup> Gittin, 59 b, 61-63; *Ib.*, Jer., V.

<sup>3</sup> Kitto's *Cycl.*, v. v. Gamaliel.

<sup>4</sup> Farrar, *Life of St. Paul*, vol. i. p. 44.

<sup>5</sup> The most convenient place where Christian scholars may find considerable information on Rabbinic schools is, perhaps, the article on "Education," by Dr. C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto's *Cyclop. of Biblical Literature*. Any one examining closely the copious references to the original Rabbinic literature will find the statements here made amply illustrated and well sustained.

<sup>6</sup> Mishna, Sota, IX. 15; Sota (*Gemara*), 49 a.

<sup>7</sup> *Life of St. Paul*, vol. i. pp. 111-114, and *Excursus*, V., where he tries to answer Hausstrath on the point under consideration.



tribute paid to Gamaliel as showing the *general* liberality of the Pharisaic party? (4) For sixteen successive generations (B. C. 30 – A. D. 415), the Presidency of the Sanhedrim was held by members of Hillel's family, perpetuating his liberal ideas. Gamaliel I. was the *third* President of this illustrious line. And when we remember that the Pharisees had complete control of the elections, we can see which way their influence as a body was exerted. No; Gamaliel as well as his school and party were liberal; and Saul, if he ever belonged to the disciples of this gentle and impartial teacher, would be an "anomaly" indeed.

In view of the foregoing discussion, the only conclusion attainable is that Saul was indeed a Pharisee, and an *extreme*<sup>1</sup> one at that, but that he never had anything to do with Gamaliel, or with any of the higher educational institutions of his day. This seems to cover all the facts: his early training in a Pharisaic family in Tarsus made him acquainted with the Bible, — the study of which was begun at five years of age, — but, owing to his Hellenistic environments, he read it mostly in the Septuagint. When yet a young man, he went to Jerusalem — as it was the yearning of every pious Jew to see the Holy City, and, if possible, to live and die in it; and here, owing to his fiery temper and strong religious nature, he associated mostly with the *Zealots*. Of course, he attended Synagogue very regularly, and there heard the Old Testament read in the Hebrew, and also the Targumic translation and paraphrase. There, too, he often heard some *Haggadist*, expounding and expanding the Scriptures by Midrashic ideas and interpolations. When Christianity began to assert itself as independent of Judaism, Saul, good Zealot that he was, felt that he "must do many things contrary to Jesus of Nazareth." Accordingly, when Stephen, the first bold proclaimer of this doctrine, was to be executed, Saul was sure to be present, and to express his uncalled-for opinion in favor of the extermination of such heretics. Nay, he even decided to ally himself with the *Sadducees* in persecuting the sect, since Christianity was more deeply hated by the haughty, aristocratic, and semi-materialistic followers of Zadok, because of the greater disparity of doctrine between themselves and the despised Nazarenes.<sup>2</sup> The high-priest, the Sadducean leader, was only too glad to enlist in his services such a fiery, active, and zealous young man as Saul of Tarsus, and he gave him letters of recommendation to the Synagogue at Damascus. The rest of the story is well known: he had no occasion to present these letters, for the "great light" which entered his soul while on the road changed his heart and made him the Apostle to the Gentiles.

There remains only to consider two objections: —

I. If the above conclusion is correct, how about the plain statement in Acts xxii. 3, that Paul *was* educated "at the feet of Gamaliel"? Our answer is that Luke, being a *Gentile* who knew almost nothing of the tenets of the Pharisees, and less about the distinction between being brought up in the *practices* and in the *learning* of the Pharisaic schools, could very easily make the mistake. He heard, of course, that Paul spent many of his early years at Jerusalem, and that *there* he received his fanatical ideas which made him a "Pharisee of the Pharisees." Now,

<sup>1</sup> This is the natural meaning of "Pharisee of Pharisees."

<sup>2</sup> In my article on "Jesus and the Pharisees," I have shown that it was always the *Sadducees* and high-priest who took the initiative against Christ. (Cf. also Acts v. 34 *sqq.*; xv. 5; xxi. 20; xxiii. 9 *sqq.*, which favor Renan's remark (Paul, III.) that "the Pharisees became almost reconciled to the disciples of Jesus.")



what more natural than for him to inquire — faithful historian that he was — about the *leader* of the Pharisaic party of that day. He easily learned that it was Gamaliel; and to make his narrative more vivid, and, as he thought, more accurate, he inserted the words "at the feet of Gamaliel" in Paul's statement of fact that he was brought up a Pharisee in the city of Jerusalem. It is in vain for Hausrath to try to invalidate the *general* truthfulness of the narrative of the Acts on such slight mistakes as these; but it is equally in vain for Canon Farrar to attempt a defense of the accuracy of such insignificant details. We cannot suppose for a moment that Luke wrote down Paul's *words* on the spot, or that he intended to give us a verbatim report of them. Let us frankly admit that there *are* some differences and even slight discrepancies between Luke's history and that obtained from the Epistles — differences due to the peculiar viewpoint of the writer, and not very essential to the religious teachings of the New Testament.

II. If Paul had no connection with *any* schools of learning, Greek or Jewish, where, then, *did* he obtain his education? We reply, —

(a) He did not have any too much education: his style shows more of an impulsive individuality than of systematic schooling. He is more intuitive than logical, more imaginative than philosophical.

(b) He must have been naturally gifted and very observant. He certainly had a keen insight into human nature, a sound judgment on the affairs of life, and a deep devotion to principle. Such traits of character have compensated many a great soul for the lack of technical training, notably so in the characters of the New Testament.

(c) His meditations in Arabia were an education. It was on the mountain slopes of Bethlehem that David received his poetic genius; it was in the wild deserts of Northern Israel that Elijah was trained to enthroned and dethroned monarchs, to organize Prophetic schools, to fight single-handed the numerous prophets of Baal. Why could not the three years of spiritual seclusion and thought make a Paul?

(d) Some allowance must also be made for special inspiration, for direct spiritual enlightenment from on high. I believe that men of such extraordinary experience as Paul's, and called upon to do such a wonderful work in life as his, will grow — *must* grow — in knowledge as well as in grace. It was the vision of the risen Christ, the transfiguration of his own soul, and the crying needs of a world steeped in idolatry, sin, and degradation, that made him earnest and eloquent.

The view, therefore, advanced in this brief article does not in the least diminish the real greatness of Paul, nor does it dim the brightness of his glorious soul. And while it may — I hope it will — modify our views as to the apostle's attainments, it does not touch his character. In fact, although the problem is chiefly of interest to Biblical students, it is primarily a *literary* question. The soundness of his doctrine remains as unimpaired as if he spent his whole life at the feet of Gamaliel; and his practical exhortations are just as useful as if he knew every Rabbinic legend and fancy. All that we contend is that Saul of Tarsus was a Bunyan, not a Milton; that his literary productions — of eternal value as they are — should be viewed as the overflow of a full, burning heart, rather than the labored achievement of a cool, cultivated, and methodical mind.

Samuel Weyler.

## SOCIOLOGICAL NOTES.

## THE UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENT IDEA.

It becomes more and more clear that the plan of the university settlements is going to be very widely adopted as a means of improving social conditions. Two new settlements are just reported from London, — one to be undertaken as a women's branch of the Mansfield House; the other under the support of the Nonconformists at Cambridge University, to establish itself in one of the needy districts of South London. Putting together all the university settlements and college missions in London, they now number about thirty. It is not difficult to see how that with the gradual increase in effectiveness which appears certain to come, this movement will have a marked influence on the future of the metropolis.

On this side of the water, the college women, who have made such a fair beginning in New York, are now preparing to begin work before long in other cities, — all of the settlements to be under the one general association. These women's settlements are, I am inclined to think, about the finest exhibitions we have of the meaning and value of the higher education of women. They indicate the possibility of the last social extremes coming into a relation with each other which shall, in a measure at least, include the different elements that go to make up life. They give even more hope than the men's settlements do, that the distracted fabric of society may after all be bound together. A university settlement has succeeded the old Neighborhood Guild in New York. A university settlement is soon to be established in Chicago, in addition to the Hull House, which carries on some valuable educational and social work in line with that of the settlements. The Andover House inaugurates its work with the beginning of the new year.

The beginning of the university settlement movement was very largely in sentiment. It was natural that it should have been. It touched the imagination as well as the moral sense. It did not have at the start a complete programme of methods. It began, as in fact all movements have begun which have worked for the improvement of the race. For this it was criticised with that sort of pharisaic cynicism which finds its easy opportunity under such circumstances.

But by this time, in London at least, unsympathetic criticism finds its argument taken away. The interest in the settlements, which at first, no doubt, often ran from sentiment into sentimentalism, has in the main resulted in intelligent and constructive action. There will, of course, be discussion as to the details by which the plan shall work itself out. But experience in London has definitely established the main principles for which the settlements stand.

The settlements express the fact that the problems of poverty in great cities can be met only through the best efforts of the best trained men and women. They do not, as some seem to think, represent a mere dramatic exhibition of the devotion young persons may have caught from life in college or university. The university stands very clearly for the many-sidedness of human powers. It stands, with almost equal distinctness, as things are now, for that isolation from the great body of men and women, which means the loss of the practical sense. A transplant of university life into the midst of masses of people is an attempt to im-

part what the university has in abundance, and to regain what it has lost.

So far as the specific work of university settlements is concerned, they stand for the fact that social evils cannot be overcome merely by theory, by legislation, by preaching, or by any single line of religious or humanitarian effort; but that they must be met by persons, who shall become fully qualified, in ample number, combining in close and constant work, on a basis of sympathy, and with careful discrimination, toward bringing to the poor, by whatever means may seem most useful, a mission of all the elements of the better life. The difference between the product of existence in Oxford and the product of existence in Whitechapel represents in so far the failure of Christian civilization: in the one place it overreaches itself, in the other it falls far behind. It is a failure which nothing less than Christian civilization in its fullness and strength can make good.

The vitality of society does not penetrate sufficiently into the extremities of the social organism. The means of social life must be reorganized and, so far as need is, reconstituted. The weakened social nerve-centres must be reinforced. The influences which make society civilized, and keep it so, must be brought to them under some specially favoring circumstances. The failure of some one kind of influence — as, for instance, of more distinctively religious effort — is not to be taken as presaging the failure of the rest, or even the final failure of that one. The simple necessity is, according to the nature of things, that the depressed classes are to be lifted by coming to them with all that tends in any way to make men what they are designed to be; by meeting them according to their needs, supplying their more conscious needs, and thus leading them into a consciousness of needs higher and nobler.

Perhaps the most indispensable element, to begin with, is that of a refined and sympathetic social intercourse. The lack of this, which is so common as to have its importance hardly thought of among the more favored classes of society, is a source of great harm among the less favored. Workers among the poor find the high scarcity value that mere friendliness has. Hence the need of organizing neighborhoods and districts for this purpose in working-class sections of cities. This also shows how important it is that those who are able to be leaders should be the neighbors of those who are to be helped in this way, committed to the same local interests, and open to that easy approach on the part of the people which comes from familiar acquaintance.

It is out of such a beginning that university settlement work, or any other kind of work taking suggestions from it, must begin. Other features one might imagine omitted, and yet some good results gained. With such a beginning, it is open to have the settlement develop into a large establishment verging upon the condition of being an institution, but it is to be hoped never passing over into an institution. This is the plan of Toynbee Hall, without a formal religious basis, and of the Oxford House, having a religious basis. Or it may remain smaller, working more intensely within a smaller range, and with fewer outward features, after the manner of the neighborhood guilds.

The university settlements stand for a larger expenditure of force than has formerly gone into social work. They introduce a high type of worker and use costly means. There is every reason to believe that this will prove the wise plan. It is beginning to be found that there is no

short and easy way to the solution of social problems. The coming stages of progress are going to demand all the best energies that society can command. There is every reason to believe that the future will bring one of its best blessings in showing this greater demand to be a greater opportunity, until all the vast resources for social improvement, in the way of cultivated intellectual, æsthetic, and moral powers, which now are often wasted, or worse than wasted, shall be turned into channels where they shall make for a higher type of society.

*Robert A. Woods.*

ANDOVER.

### BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

**HAND-COMMENTAR ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT.** Bearbeitet von Professor D. H. J. HOLTZMANN in Strassburg, Geh. Kirchenrath Professor D. R. A. LIPSIIUS in Jena, Lic. P. W. SCHMIEDEL in Jena, Prediger Lic. H. v. SODEN in Berlin. Vierter Band. Erste Abtheilung. JOHANNESCHES EVANGELIUM Bearbeitet von HOLTZMANN. 8vo, pp. viii, 206. Freiburg i. B.: Akademisches Verlagsbuchhandlung von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). 1890.

This commentary, the first volume of which was noticed in the "Andover Review," vol. xiii. 466, is now happily completed, and some account of its general plan and distinctive features will be in place here. The projectors of the "Hand-Commentar" believe — and their conviction will be shared by all who are acquainted with the literature — that, notwithstanding the large and constantly increasing number of commentaries on the New Testament and the excellence of many of them, there is none which exactly meets the needs of the large class of theological students, ministers, and others, who, without being New Testament scholars by profession, desire to avail themselves of the results of the best exegetical scholarship. For their use the existing commentaries are too bulky, too costly, and — worse still — too wasteful of the time of those who have to consult them. As a consequence, few theological students are able during their course to work through the whole New Testament, or even the greater part of it, and when once fairly in the work of the ministry they, in too many cases, give up all attempt at connected exegetical study. One chief cause of this state of things is that the interpretation of the text is buried in the history of interpretation; that with fatal conscientiousness all the aberrations of exegesis are recorded and refuted, opinions which have hardly even an historical interest are preserved from deserved oblivion, and the votes of the long array of commentators scrupulously registered. Second only to this is the accumulation of philological, historical, and archæological learning having no necessary connection with the interpretation of the passage in hand, and sometimes quite irrelevant. And back of both of these is a method which makes the commentary consist of an accumulation of glosses on words, phrases, and constructions, or on historical or doctrinal statements, rather than an elucidation of the writer's meaning by the reproduction of his train of thought, or the association of his ideas. I should not deny that the glossarial method has a legitimate place and use; but it is entirely out of place in a commentary which is meant to be not a quarry for lexicographers and grammarians, but a working tool in the hands of students and busy men. The

best examples of the kind of commentary of which we have been speaking are the best illustrations of this fact.

The difficulty, not to say impossibility, of using apparatus of this sort has led to the creation, especially in England and America, of a multitude of so-called "practical" commentaries, which are for the most part entirely unpractical, because exegetically worthless; the student consults them in vain where he needs them most.

The "Hand-Commentar" is, first of all, a purely critical and exegetical commentary; its aim is to help the student to understand the New Testament, not to save him the trouble of making his own sermons. It gives no history of exegesis, no mass of names and opinions; grammatical, lexical, and Biblico-theological notes are strictly subordinated to the ends of interpretation; textual criticism is kept within the narrowest limits. It gives in concise but clear and readable form a continuous comment which represents the present state of the interpretation of the New Testament — its results, and its problems. It is one of the conspicuous excellences of the work that it deals so frankly and so fairly with the open questions both of criticism and of exegesis. The authors of the commentary represent the critical school of German New Testament scholars; but without denying that standpoint, their aim has been to produce a work of such an objective character that its acceptableness and usefulness should not be limited by lines of schools or parties, and it is right to say that this difficult aim has been in a great measure attained.

The commentary fills four volumes. The first contains the Synoptic Gospels (on the synopsis of the Gospels) and the Acts, by Holtzmann; the second, the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, by Schmiedel, and Galatians, Romans, and Philippians, by Lipsius; the third, Colossians, Ephesians, Philemon, and the Pastoral Epistles, by Schmiedel, and Hebrews, Peter, James, and Jude, by v. Soden; the fourth, the Gospel and Epistles of John, and the Revelation, by Holtzmann. The typography is peculiarly clear; and no pains has been spared in the arrangement, and in analyses, indexes, etc., to facilitate both reading and reference. The price, equivalent to about \$7.00 for the whole work, is remarkably low.

With the exception of the Apocalypse, Professor Holtzmann's commentary on the Johannean writings, which forms the fourth volume of the series, is, like that on the Synoptic Gospels, the fruit of his courses of lectures at the university during the last thirty years, and represents his mature and well-considered opinions. His present position in the Johannean question, as he tells us in the Preface, was not reached at once nor easily. Constrained to give up the apostolic authorship of the Gospel and Epistles, — which he had never held with entire confidence, — he tried in succession the more important mediating hypotheses, until, nearly twenty years ago, he came substantially to the views embodied in this commentary. Subsequent studies, in which the exegetical and the historical results confirmed each other, have strengthened his conviction that the solution of the problem lies in this way.

In the Introduction the nature of the critical, exegetical, and historical problems presented by the gospel is set forth with a clearness which leaves nothing to be desired. The fourth Gospel differs from the Synoptics not only in important historical points, such as the day of Jesus's death, but in its entire material, and still more in its essential character. It is a theological gospel, a "doctrinal treatise in the form of a gospel"

(Pfleiderer). The works of Jesus — the *σημεία* — are symbols with a profound significance, so that the miracle has a distinctive stamp, his words have a deeper meaning than at first appears; instead of the emphasis upon fulfilled prediction, we have a subtle typology. And in the teaching of the gospel is reflected much of the inner and outer history of the church of the first century. The development of its Christology and the antagonism which it encountered, especially from the Jewish side, are carried back into the life of Christ himself. This is the peculiar character of the controversy with the Jews in the gospel. The Prologue to the gospel, the doctrine of the Logos, confirms the impression of the nature and end of the gospel which we gain from its contents. It justifies us in regarding it, as Chastaud has said, less as a new history of Jesus, than as "a philosophy of the history of the Redeemer." The intimate relation of the Logos philosophy to the whole content and character of the gospel, especially in its universality — mission of Christianity to the *κόσμος* — is properly emphasized. All this would long since have been universally recognized, on purely exegetical grounds, if the church had not, from at least the latter part of the second century, always regarded the gospel as a legacy of the Apostle John. From an apostle, and above all from this apostle, we should expect a representation of the life of Jesus which, as compared with the Synoptics, had more distinctly the impress of reality, of historical character. On the contrary, the gospel which bears his name, as we have seen, is preëminently ideal and doctrinal. This antinomy, which is now universally recognized, constitutes the Johannine problem.

Passing from this general statement of the question, Holtzmann considers the circumstances under which the gospel was written. In regard to the date of the gospel, he repeats a striking sentence from his "Einleitung:" "From our point of view we may fairly say that the earlier we are able to put the fourth Gospel in the development of the early Christian literature, the more comprehensible the enigma of its origin becomes." But we cannot push the date back into the apostolic age, if the Synoptic tradition began to deposit compact results only after 70 A. D., and the process did not come to an end before the beginning of the second century. The internal evidence points to Asia Minor as the region in which the gospel originated; but Holtzmann fully recognizes also the Palestinian local color, the familiarity with the scenes and surroundings of Jesus's ministry. All indications point to a Jewish Christian of Hellenistic descent and training as the author.

The third division of the Introduction deals with the historical character of the gospel, its plan and division, the marks of unhistorical character, its value as a historical source.

This Introduction adds strength to the impression which I have gained from the recent literature on both sides of this most vexed question, that real progress is making. I shall not say toward a solution of the Johannine problem which shall command the assent of the great body of scholars, but at least toward a statement of the problem that shall be just to all the factors which make its singular complexity. It will be a great gain if we cannot agree, that we should at least be agreed about what we differ.

I have spoken at such length of the Introduction, that I must deal very briefly with the commentary. Its distinguishing feature, and one in which it marks a long step in advance, is the practical recognition of the peculiar problem which the allegorical, typical, symbolical elements



in the gospel present to the interpreter, who is everywhere challenged to discover the meaning *under* the act or word. In many places where commentators have disputed whether the writer meant this or that, the true answer is, he meant both. In this there is a temptation to find subtleties where none exist; and it is the best tribute to the sobriety and uniform good sense of Holtzmann's exegesis that he escapes this peril.

A few misprints, especially in Hebrew words, have fallen under my eye; in general the printing is very correct. On page 25, l. 10, for *Imperatives* read *Infinitives*; p. 61, l. 12, the noun שֵׁכֶן is found, unless I am mistaken, only in late rabbinical Hebrew.

George F. Moore.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN KANONS. Historisch-kritische Untersuchung von Dr. G. WILDEBOER, ord. Professor der Theologie zu Groningen. 8vo, pp. xii, 164. Gotha: F. A. Perthes. 1891.

This is a revised German edition of the author's "Het Outstaan van den Kanon des Ouden Verbonds," Groningen, 1889. In its original form it deserved the high commendations it received on all hands; and we are glad to see it made accessible, through this translation, to a wider circle of readers, not only on the Continent, but in England and America. The importance of the subject both from the critical and the theological point of view need not be dwelt upon. As the author truly says, only a clear insight into the way in which the books of the Old Testament were brought together can give us a firm basis for a just conception of the Bible. And in spite of—or perhaps I should rather say because of—the extensive literature upon the subject, there was need of a fresh comprehensive critical investigation of the whole question. This Professor Wildeboer has given us in the work before us.

After describing the threefold division of the Jewish Canon, and indicating the preliminary inferences which we are justified in drawing from these facts, he examines with exhaustive thoroughness the testimony of the Old Testament, the Græek writings of the Jews (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus), the Talmud, and other later Jewish works, the notices of the Jewish Canon in the Church Fathers. He then discusses in a very instructive way the important question of the idea of canonicity in the Jewish schools, and, consequently, the criteria by which books—especially those of late date—were received into the Canon or excluded from it.

Proceeding from the critical to the constructive part of his task, the history of the collection of the books of the Old Testament, he sets forth its three stages, the canonization of the Law, of the Prophets, and of the "Hagiographa." The canonization of the Law was the work of Ezra, who in 444 B. C. got the Book of the Law of Moses which Yahweh had commanded Israel formally adopted by the Assembly of the people (Neh. viii.-x.). The canonization of the Prophets (including the Prophetic Histories) was the work of Jerusalem scribes, and must have been accomplished by 200 B. C., since Jesus the son of Sirach attests its completeness, and since the book of Daniel (cir. 165 B. C.) did not find a place in it. For the third Canon, the "Hagiographa," we have no absolutely certain *terminus ad quem* before the reduction of the Mishna, about 200 A. D. Josephus and 4 Ezra show, indeed, that the number of the Old Testament books was substantially fixed a century



earlier, but apparently only by prevailing opinion. In the second century the canonicity of several of these books was sharply challenged, and it was not until after the time of R. Akiba († 135 A. D.) that the question was formally and finally settled by the schools.

A concluding paragraph exhibits in summary review the process by which the Jewish Canon was formed, and discusses the relation of the Christian theologian to it. The Christian Church can accept, in the main, the Hebrew Canon, "not because of what the scribes meant to give, but of what they actually handed down." But a Christian delimitation of the Canon would exclude Esther and the Song of Songs. On the other hand, there is no reason why it should adopt any of the so-called Apocrypha. Even Sirach, compared with Proverbs, is devoid of all originality.

It is encouraging to note an approach to agreement among Old Testament as well as among New Testament scholars of all schools in regard to the formation of the Canon; and it is not without interest to observe that those among them who are ordinarily ranked among the conservatives on this point seem not disinclined to go beyond the other side; as one may see in Weiss' *New Testament Introduction*, or in this book of Professor Wildeboers. But the differences are here no longer of much moment. All can now assent to the words of Loescher († 1749) which have often been quoted:—

Canon non uno, quod dicunt, actu ab hominibus, sed paulatim a Deo, animorum temporumque rectore, productus est. And in the Old Testament the disagreement as to the date at which this process ceased is more formal than real.

In conclusion, let me say that this book should be studied by all who want to reach "a firm basis for a just conception of the Bible."

*George F. Moore.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO ETHICS. By CLARK J. MURRAY, LL. D., F. R. S. C., Professor of Philosophy, McGill College, Montreal. 8vo, pp. 407. Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co. 1891.

A good text-book in ethics supplies a much felt want at the present day. This want Professor Murray has tried to meet. But in estimating the extent to which he has succeeded, we are not to forget the limitations which he imposed upon himself at the outset. He remarks that introductions to ethics are commonly employed to present "a philosophic discussion of the ultimate conceptions which lie at the foundation of the science." His own deviation, at least to some extent, from this usage is indicated in the observation that he intends "to introduce to the science those who are as yet unfamiliar with its fundamental concepts, except in so far as these are implied in all our ordinary thoughts about human life." This remark should determine the expectations of every one who sees the title. In dealing with his subject after the manner of his purpose, the author, at least in a portion of the book, has admirably succeeded in the succinctness and compactness of his analysis. This is mainly true of the chapters on "The Moral Consciousness" and "The Supreme Law of Duty." Part II. on "The Classification of Moral Obligations" is equally concise and systematic, but will appear so general as to take on less of the interest than concrete questions of ethics are supposed to excite. It deals with men's duties in the most general way

possible, — no doubt as fully as a text of the kind would permit, and yet not fully enough to give the work all the merits that it is desirable it should possess.

There is a great weakness in the first few chapters which treat of the physical and psychical nature of man. Those who already understand the subject in its main features, and who know what the object can be in discussing the constitution of man, will at once perceive what the author is aiming at in these chapters. But a young student will not be so ready or so fortunate. He requires first to know why it is necessary to enter into the questions about man's nature, physical or psychical, before he can appreciate the references to heredity and various influences affecting character. This discussion should have been preceded by a careful analysis of the ethical problem and its concepts, and by the proof of what man's physical nature and the forces of heredity do to influence his conduct. As it is, the student is not warned of what the bearings of heredity upon the problem are. Man's physical nature and heredity may avail to limit his freedom or his responsibility, but we are not prepared for this understanding of the case by anything that the author has done, and hence it is likely that the student will fail to appreciate what is said and done in these first chapters. It would have been more to the point to have defined very carefully the conditions of moral action, and then the mind would have been prepared for understanding the meaning and relevancy of the facts of heredity. In regard to other portions of the work it can be said that it is less open to criticism. The treatment of "the moral consciousness" presents a very good outline of the phenomena connected with it, and it does not detract from it that the discussion is somewhat elementary. On the question of the freedom of the will, there is a failure to see that determinism is not always or necessarily allied with fatalism or materialism. Kant's position was deterministic, and there may be a subjective determinism which, so far from being identical with necessarianism, is indispensable to freedom. There is an opportunity here to appropriate the very language of the determinist in behalf of the opposite doctrine, and to get the advantage of admitting the idea that volition is determined and yet not unfree, since the determining cause is the subject, and not an event which is only an occasion. This view of the case, however, is passed over by the author.

The chapter on "The Supreme Law of Duty" classifies all theories of ethics as either "epicurean" or "stoical." This we think quite misleading, because it is likely to prejudice the mind with the historical associations connected with those theories. Popular writers have so generally fixed the common conceptions of those terms, and also created a system of antipathy against one and sympathy for the other, that these feelings will at once be transferred to any theory so named to-day. Historical classifications in philosophy seldom avoid invidious reflections.

The classification of social duties into determinate and indeterminate is very apt, and will prove useful to the science, whether it be regarded as new or old. The fact is that the discussion of ethical theories has been rendered very confusing, because of the failure to recognize the difference between the different kinds of virtue that may be comprehended under justice and benevolence. The latter being indeterminate provides a distinct place for a class of meritorious acts that are not universally or absolutely, but only conditionally obligatory.

J. H. Hyslop.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF JOSEPH HARDY NEESIMA. By ARTHUR SHERBURNE HARDY. Pp. vi, 350. Houghton, Mifflin and Company. 1891. \$2.00.

Professor Hardy's "Life and Letters of Joseph Hardy Neesima" will give great satisfaction to the many friends of that noble man. The author's literary instinct was not at fault when he judged that "no pen could reveal the personality of the man, or tell the story of his life, so effectively as his own;" and he must be a dull reader indeed who, as he rises from the perusal of this book, cannot say with the author, "The reading of his letters and journal made upon me a deep impression."

To the intimate friends and associates of Neesima these pages will perhaps reveal no new trait of character, but they certainly render more clear and vivid the already recognized characteristics of that remarkable man. The fuller account of his early life, written in 1885, which appears on pp. 13-45, is the freshest portion of the book, and is interesting not only as a remarkably graphic picture of life in the yashiki of a daimyō, but also as showing that the good fortune, the touch of the Unseen Hand, — to use his own favorite expression, — so manifest in the later stages of his life, was not absent in his earliest years. Like Paul and Jeremiah, he was called from his mother's womb and before. It is true the family were the vassals of a dissolute prince, but in other respects his surroundings must have been unusual. He is a favorite and a frequent visitor at the home of a childless "elder man," one of the daimyō's councillors. "Staying there towards evening I often slept on his lap and was carried home in his arms. When I began to draw some pictures I used to take them to show to him, and he was really delighted to see the progress I made. . . . He often took me with him when he went out to worship his ancestors or his guardian gods. I was really attached to him, because he loved me as if I were his own son. He was a good horseman and expert in shooting arrows. Moreover, he was a man of some character. He often rebuked his prince for his extreme arbitrariness and also for his excessive drinking. So the prince felt uncomfortable and sent him off to his castle town, Annoka. . . . I wept bitterly when I took my last farewell. He was somewhat affected, but manfully concealed it, and showed me an affectionate and touching smile. His last word to me was, 'Good-by, Shimeta! be a good boy' " (p. 20).

His grandfather, too, must have been a noble and lovable man. "One day I was naughty and refused to make an errand for my mother, and when she gave me a scolding I returned her an improper word. My grandfather heard it, came directly after me, and caught me without saying a word, rolled me up in a night coverlet, and shut me up in a closet. After an hour's confinement I was released from the punishment, which was, I believe, the first one I ever received from my grandfather. I thought he was too severe for a trifling offense, and went into a corner of the parlor to weep. After a while he came to me and urged me gently that I must no longer weep. Then he told me a story of the bamboo-shoot, in a most tender and affectionate manner I ever heard before. It was told in a native poem which means as follows: 'If I do not care for it, I would never use my rod for shaking the snow off from the down-bent branch of a young bamboo-shoot.' Then he asked, 'Do you understand its meaning, my dear?' and explained its meaning himself: 'You are young yet, and just as tender as a bamboo-shoot. If your evil inclinations spoil you, as a slight pressure of snow might easily

break down the tender shoot, how sad I should be, my dear. Do you suppose I am unkind to you by thus punishing you?' I remained speechless then, but I understood full well what he meant, and what kind intention he had for correcting me" (pp. 17, 18). The picture of the family gathering at the feast prepared by his grandfather in honor of his final departure from home (p. 33) is as beautiful as it is true to Japanese life. In Japan, tea and *saké* form a part of every feast; only the cup of parting, especially when there is slight hope of meeting again, is of water, and drunk by all the assembled guests from the same cup. In this case, as it passed from lip to lip, "every one who was present wept, and none raised up their faces except myself and my grandfather. He skillfully concealed his tears and appeared unusually cheerful: and I kept myself very brave. When the dinner was over my grandfather said to me: 'My dear child, your future will be like seeking a pleasure on a mountain of full blossoms. Go your way without fear.' This unexpected parting from his lips gave me a full courage to start from home like a man."

The means which he had for gratifying his unquenchable thirst for knowledge and his improvement of them were unusual from the very first. When he left Japan "his knowledge of the Chinese classics was extensive; he was an expert penman and a natural artist. He had mastered in Dutch the elements of arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and navigation, and acquired the rudiments of physics and astronomy. His note-books on the former subjects are almost treatises. He rewrites in his own language every demonstration, and solves innumerable problems and exercises" (p. 46).

His patriotic love for his people and his sorrow over their corruption are marked. The new truth he seeks is for them quite as much as for himself: "The ambition of the people was completely crushed down. Many samurai had almost forgotten how to use their swords. Coats of mail were stored in warehouses as curiosities, and were useless from decay. In fact the people had become cowardly, corrupt, and effeminate. Licentiousness prevailed almost universally. Truly some reformation was needed." "What struck me most was the corrupt condition of the people. I thought then, a material progress will prove itself useless so long as their morals are in such a deplorable state. Japan needs a moral reformation more than mere material progress, and my purpose was more strengthened to visit a foreign land" (pp. 21-34). Such statements as these enable us to understand the surprise and grief (p. 92) which he felt at the indifference of American students to the Christianization of their country. "I felt so sorry for their coldness in their heart, and disinterest for the church of Christ and for the welfare of their own country. All heathens look at America as the centre of the Christian light. If the centre of the light has not much intenseness, how could it light those who are lying in the remote dark corners? My dear friend, let us pray earnestly for those Christians who live for themselves and not for Christ."

Mr. Neesima was not only a patriot and a Christian, he was ever a most courteous gentleman. Doubtless one cause of this may be traced to the fact which he apprises us of in the statement: "I was sent to a school of etiquette, to learn to make the most profound bows, most graceful manners and movements, etc., in a company of noblemen. I believe I spent more than a year in acquiring the old-fashioned politeness, although I was not aware at the time of its benefit."

The story of the voyage to America with the unexampled kindness of captain and crew, the "boundless love and untiring interest" manifested in his temporal and spiritual welfare by Mr. and Mrs. Hardy, and his experience as a student at Andover and Amherst, Professor Hardy allows him to tell in his own simple and unaffected language. Nothing in the life of Neesima was more remarkable than the way in which he not only made friends everywhere, but always touched every one whom he met at his best point, emphasizing and developing it, and so giving more than he received.

Writing to Mrs. Hardy for her consent to join the church, he makes this confession of faith and vow:—

"Now I believe Jesus Christ is the Son of God who died for our sins and we shall be saved through Him. I love Jesus more than anything else. I cast whole self to Him, and try to do right before his sight. This is my vow. I will go back to Japan to turn the people to Jesus from Devil. I determined myself to Jesus so fast that nothing can separate my love from Him. My flesh is weaker than my spirit; therefore I wish to join church, and to unite in Christ, that I may grow more Christlike, and I may do great good to my nation for his name's sake."

His whole subsequent life shows how sincere he was in this vow. "A plow was on my hands" always. Invited by Minister Mori to give his aid to the Japanese embassy which visited this country in 1872, he consented only on the conditions that his Christian faith and his freedom from obligations to the government should be recognized. Believing that there was the idea of worship involved in the almost prostrate bow which Japanese officials expect from their inferiors, he declined to make it to the members of the embassy. The following delicious account of his first meeting with Mr. Tanaka, the commissioner of education, with whom he afterward visited the colleges and universities of America and Europe, well shows his sturdy faith, his humor, and his adroitness. "When he (Mr. Tanaka) noticed me standing erect (after all the others had bowed) he asked Mr. Mori whether the corner-stander was Mr. Neesima. When he ascertained that it was, he stepped forward from his seat, shook my hand, and made a most graceful and dignified bow to me, asking me to be a kind friend to him. He bowed himself 60° from the perpendicular. So I made like bow in return. . . . When the meeting was dismissed, the other Japanese students made 30° bow from the perpendicular to the commissioner without shaking his hand. But he came to me and asked where I reside, and asked me to call on him privately. He then shook my hand and made 70° bow to me, wishing me for the improvement of my health. I could not help laughing within my heart that a behind or corner-stander was so honored by him" (p. 121).

His letters bring out clearly the great advantage to him in his future work of this connection with the embassy.

Of his return to Japan, his warm reception by his fellow-countrymen and the mission, his ceaseless labors for the evangelization of Japan, the laying of the foundations of the Doshisha school and its development into a university, and his death at Oisō with the map of Japan spread out before him that he might encourage his brethren in the work of evangelization, there is no space, perhaps no need, to write. It is the portion of his life most open and familiar to the public.

Upon this part of the book I wish, however, to make two remarks.

First, the cursory reader is liable to infer a less cordial relation between him and the missionaries than really existed. He never for a moment lost the confidence of the mission, and Professor Hardy's remark, "The personal friendship between Mr. Neesima and his colleagues of the Kyoto station was very strong," might well have been extended to the mission at large. Mr. Neesima himself writes to the prudential committee (p. 279): "The success your missionaries have had is largely due to their readiness to accept our participation in the work. Though they are Americans in citizenship, they are Japanese in heart. They stand affectionately by us and with us, and most of us appreciate this more and more." My second remark is, that Mr. Neesima in some of his letters fails to give the mission the credit it deserves for the early formed purpose to establish, not simply a "training-school," but a college. In a paper which now lies before me, sent out from the Boston Mission Rooms in 1876, the year after the Doshisha was established, there is the statement of "an earnest and eloquent appeal" made by the Japan Mission — before the founding of the Doshisha, if I am not mistaken — "for \$100,000 to establish a college in that country." In this paper the mission is quoted as saying: "We ask for the immediate endowment and equipment of a Christian college in Japan. The need is immediate. There is no time to wait. There never was a time in Japan so full of promise and yet so full of danger, and each day of delay makes the promise less, and the danger greater." The Board was not able to respond to this appeal, and so the growth of the college was slower than both Mr. Neesima and the mission desired.

The book closes with several warm tributes to Mr. Neesima's character and work from prominent Japanese of different beliefs.

There are more typographical errors than are usually found in books from this press, chiefly though not entirely confined to Japanese names: Page 211, *Miyagama* for *Miyagawa*; p. 213, *Wakanoma* for *Wakano-ura*; 219, Wild River for Wild Rover; 221, *Fukuchigama* for *Fukuchiyama*; 223, *Tōkōy* for *Tōkyō*. The author is not uniform in his transliteration of Japanese names.

M. L. Gordon.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

*Roberts Brothers, Boston.* The Crisis in Morals. An Examination of Rational Ethics in the Light of Modern Science. By James Thompson Bixby, Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Leipzig. Pp. vii, 315. 1891. \$1.00.

*A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.* The Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Roberston Nicoll, M. A., LL. D., Editor of the Expositor. The Acts of the Apostles. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and Vicar of All Saints, Blackrock. Pp. xiii, 424.

*Holt & Co., New York.* Handbook of Psychology, Feeling, and Will. By James Mark Baldwin, M. A., Ph. D., Professor in University of Toronto, author of "Handbook of Psychology, Senses, and Intellect." Pp. xi, 394. 1891.

*Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.* For sale by Damrell & Upham, Boston. The Use and Abuse of Money. By W. Cunningham, D. D., Vicar of Great St. Mary's and University Lecturer, Cambridge. Pp. viii, 219. 1891. \$1.00. — The Philosophy of the Beautiful. Being Outlines of the History of Æsthetics. By William Knight, Professor of Philosophy in the University



of St. Andrews. Pp. xv, 288. 1891. \$1.00. — *Elsket, and Other Stories.* By Thomas Nelson Page. Pp. 208. 1891. \$1.00. — *The Boy Settlers. A Story of Early Times in Kansas.* By Noah Brooks. Pp. 252. 1891. \$1.25. — *A New Mexico David, and Other Stories and Sketches of the Southwest.* By Charles F. Lummis. Pp. 217. 1891. \$1.25. — *The Fine Arts.* By G. Baldwin Brown, sometime Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford, and Professor of Fine Art in the University of Edinburgh. Pp. xii, 321. 1891. \$1.00. — *The High-Top Sweeting, and Other Poems.* By Elizabeth Akers. Pp. vii, 142. 1891. \$1.25. — *English Colonization and Empire.* By Alfred Caldecott, M. A. (Camb. and Lond.), Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge, sometime University Extension Lecturer under the Cambridge Syndicate. Pp. viii, 277. 1891. \$1.00. — *Across Russia, from the Baltic to the Danube.* By Charles Augustus Stoddard. Pp. ix, 258. 1891. \$1.50. — *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* By S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford. Pp. xviii, 520. 1891. \$2.50. — *Nature and Man in America.* By N. S. Shaler, Professor of Geology in Harvard University. Pp. ix, 283. \$1.50. — *The Incarnation of the Son of God. Being the Bampton Lectures for the year 1891.* By Charles Gore, M. A., Principal of Pusey House, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. Pp. xxi, 295. \$1.50. — *Essays on English Literature.* By Edmund Scherer. Translated by George Saintsbury. Pp. x, 309. — *Lyra Heroica. A Book of Verse for Boys.* Selected and arranged by William Ernest Henley. Pp. xvii, 364. \$1.25. — *The Tests of Various Kinds of Truth. Being a Treatise of Applied Logic.* By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., D. L., ex-President of Princeton College, N. J. Pp. vii, 132. \$1.00. — *On the Border with Crook.* By John G. Bourke, Captain Third Cavalry, U. S. A. Pp. xiii, 491. \$3.50. — *Stories for Boys.* By Richard Harding Davis. Illustrated. Pp. 204. \$1.00. — *Patrick Henry. Life, Correspondence, and Speeches.* By William Wirt Henry. With Portrait. Vol. I. Pp. xx, 622. — *University Extension Manuals.* Edited by Professor Knight. *English Colonization and Empire.* By Alfred Caldecott, M. A. (Camb. and Lond.), Fellow and Dean of St. John's College, Cambridge, Sometime University Extension Lecturer under the Cambridge Syndicate. Pp. viii, 277. 1891. \$1.00. — *Marie Antoinette and the Downfall of Royalty.* By Imbert de Saint-Amand. Translated by Elizabeth Gilbert Martin. With Portrait. Pp. vi, 401. 1891. \$1.25. — *The Divorce of Catharine of Aragon. The Story as told by the Imperial Ambassadors Resident at the Court of Henry VIII. In usum Laicorum.* By J. A. Froude. Being a Supplementary volume to the author's *History of England.* Pp. xi, 476. 1891. \$2.50. — *Ocean Steamships. A Popular Account of their Construction, Development, Management, and Appliances.* By F. E. Chadwick, U. S. N., J. D. J. Kelley, U. S. N., Ridgely Hunt, U. S. N., John H. Gould, William H. Rideing, A. E. Seaton, With ninety-six Illustrations. Pp. xv, 298. 1891. \$3.00. — *Among the Camps ; or, Young People's Stories of the War.* By Thomas Nelson Page. Illustrated. Pp. 163. 1891. \$1.50. — *Japonica.* By Sir Edwin Arnold, M. A., K. C. I. E., C. S. I., author of "The Light of Asia." With Illustrations by Robert Blum. Pp. 128. 1891. \$3.00. — *English Social Movements.* By Robert Archer Woods, Lecturer at Andover Seminary, and Head of the Andover House, in Boston. Pp. vii, 277. 1891. \$1.50. — *A History of the French Revolution.* By H. Morse Stephens, Balliol College, Oxford. In Three Volumes. Vol. II. Pp. xv, 561. 1891. \$2.50. — *Children's Stories in English Literature from Shakespeare to Tennyson.* By Henrietta Christian Wright. Pp. vi, 454. 1891. \$1.25. — *Jesus, the Carpenter of Nazareth.* By a Layman. Second Edition Revised. Pp. xi, 498. 1891. \$1.50.

*J. M. Klüh, Chicago, Ill.* *The Story of the Childhood and Passion of the Lord Jesus the Saviour.* In the words of the Evangelists and Traditions. By John M. Klüh. Printed with an alphabet of forty-five letters. Pp. x, 70. 1892. Cloth, 75 cents.

*Chicago Young Men's Era Publishing Co.* *A History of the Preparation of*



the World for Christ. By Rev. David R. Breed, D. D. With Maps, Charts, and Illustrations. Pp. vii, 388. 1891.

*B. Westermann & Co., New York.* Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte die Entwicklung des Dogmas in rahmen der Abendländischen Kirche, von Dr. Adolf Harnack, Professor der Kirchengeschichte an der Universität Berlin. Zweite Hälfte. Pp. iv, 138.

*Advertiser Printing House, Newark, N. J.* The Saengerfest Sermons. By James Boyd Brady, B. D., D. D., Pastor of Franklin Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Newark, N. J. Pp. xi, 323. 1891.

*Cambridge, England, at the University Press.* Pitt Press Series. Milton's Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity, L' Allegro, Il Penseroso, and Lycidas. With Introduction, Notes, and Indexes. By A. Wilson Verity, M. A., Sometime Scholar of Trinity College. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Pp. xlix, 172.

*Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society, Boston and Chicago.* Sermons on the International Sunday-School Lessons for 1892. By the Monday Club. Seventeenth Series. Pp. 404. \$1.25.

*Gospel of Christ Print, Grafton.* The Structure of the Bible. A Proof of the Verbal Inspiration of Scripture. By Ivan Panin. Pp. xxiii, 204. 1891-2.

*Wiley & Co., Springfield.* Africa and America. Addresses and Discourses. By Alex. Crummell, Rector of St. Luke's Church, Washington, D. C., author of "Future of Africa," etc. Pp. vii, 466. 1891.

*The New York State Reformatory Press, Elmira, N. Y.* Papers in Penology. Second Series. Compiled by the Editor of "The Summary." Pp. iii, 148. 1891. Copies of the pamphlet may be obtained, without cost, upon application to the General Superintendent.

*A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York.* Fellowship with Christ, and other Discourses delivered on Special Occasions. By R. W. Dale, LL. D., Birmingham. Pp. viii, 368. 1892. \$1.75. For sale by De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., Boston. — The Preacher and his Models. The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1891. By the Rev. James Stalker, D. D., author of "Imago Christi," "The Life of Jesus Christ," etc. Pp. xii, 284. 1891. For sale by De Wolfe, Fiske & Co., Boston. \$1.50.

*M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin; Bensiga Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and Chicago.* An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul and of The Catholic Epistles, consisting of an Introduction to each Epistle, an Analysis of each Chapter, a Paraphrase of the Sacred Text, and a Commentary, etc. By his Grace the Most Rev. John MacEvilly, D. D., Archbishop of Tuam. Vol. I. Fourth Edition. Enlarged, Revised, and Corrected. Pp. xxi, 457; Vol. II. Pp. 475. 1891.

*The Baker & Taylor Co., New York.* The Divine Enterprise of Missions. A Series of Lectures delivered at New Brunswick, N. J., before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in America, upon the "Graves" Foundation, in the months of January and February, 1891. By Arthur T. Pierson. Pp. 333, 16mo. \$1.25.

*From Methodist Book Concern. Hunt & Eaton, New York.* Boston Homilies. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1892. By Members of the Alpha Chapter of the Convocation of Boston University. Second Series. Pp. 427. 1891. \$1.25. — A Winter in India and Malaysia among the Methodist Missions. By Rev. M. V. B. Knox, Ph. D., D. D. With an Introduction by Bishop John F. Hurst, D. D., LL. D. Pp. 308. 1891. \$1.20. For sale by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. — Bible Miracles and Modern Thought. By Prof. L. T. Townsend, D. D. Pp. 48. 1891. Paper, 15 cents. For sale by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. — Fact and Fiction in Holy Writ; or Book and World Wonders. By Rev. J. Hendrickson McCarty, M. D., D. D., author of "Two Thousand Miles through the Heart of Mexico," "Inside the Gates," "The Black Horse and Carryall," etc. Pp. 348. 1891. \$1.00. — The Story of Sodom. A Biblical Episode. By W. C. Kitchin. Illustrated by W. P. Snyder. Pp. 285. 1891. \$1.50. — Faith, Hope, Love, and Duty. By Daniel Wise, D. D., author of "Path of Life," "Pleasant Pathways," etc. Pp. 315. 1891. \$1.00. — The Oldest Drama in the World: The Book of

Job. Arranged in Dramatic Form, with Elucidations. By Rev. Alfred Walls. With a Prefatory Note by Henry A. Butts, D. D., LL. D., President of Drew Theological Seminary. Pp. 124. 1891. — Gospel Singers and their Songs. By F. D. Hemenway, D. D., and Charles B. Stuart, B. D. Pp. 195. 1891. 80 cents. — ΚΟΔΑΣΙΣ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ, or Future Retribution. By George W. King, Pastor of the Broadway Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, R. I. Pp. 267. 1891. \$1.00. — Illustrative Notes. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday-school Lessons for 1892. Including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Notes, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams, etc. By Jesse L. Hurlbut, D. D., and Robert R. Doherty, Ph. D. Pp. 396. 1891. \$1.25. — Saint Matthew's Witness to Words and Works of the Lord; or, Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of his Earliest Evangelist. By Francis W. Upham, LL. D., author of "The Church and Science; or, The Ancient Hebraic Idea of the Days of Creation," etc., etc. Pp. 15, 415. \$1.20.

*Longmans, Green & Co., New York.* General View of the Political History of Europe. By Ernest Lavisse, Professor at the Sorbonne. Translated with the author's sanction, by Charles Gross, Ph. D., Instructor in History, Howard University. Pp. xi, 188. 1891. \$1.25. For sale by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. — Problems of Christianity and Skepticism. Lessons from Twenty Years' Experience in the Field of Christian Evidence. By the Rev. Alex. Harrison, B. D., Vicar of Lightcliffe Evidential Mission of the Church Parochial Mission Society. Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society. Pp. ix, 340. 1891. \$2.25.

*Anson D. F. Randolph & Co., New York.* The New York Obelisk, Cleopatra's Needle. With a Preliminary Sketch of the History, Erection, Uses, and Signification of Obelisks. By Charles E. Moldenke, A. M., Ph. D. Pp. viii, 202. 1891. \$2.00.

*Fleming H. Revell Company, New York and Chicago.* Temptation. A Talk to Young Men. By James Stalker, D. D., author of "Life of Christ," etc. Pp. 31. 20 cents. — The Dew of thy Youth. A Message to Endeavorers. By Rev. J. R. Miller, D. D. Pp. 29. 20 cents.

*Mast, Crowell & Kirkpatrick, Springfield, Ohio.* The Pilgrim's Progress from this World to that which is to Come. Delivered under the Similitude of a Dream. By John Bunyan. New Illustrated Edition. Pp. xviii, 296.

*Review and Herald Publishing Co., Battle Creek, Michigan; Chicago, Illinois.* The Two Republics of Rome and the United States of America. By Alonso T. Jones. Pp. 895. 1891.

*Nile C. Smith Publishing Co., Chicago.* Thais. By Anatole France. Translated by A. D. Hall. Pp. 205.

*Cambridge University Press Warehouse, C. J. Clay & Sons, London.* The Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools. The Book of Joshua. With Map, Introduction, and Notes. By John Sutherland Black, M. A. Edited for the Syndics of the University Press. Pp. 107. 1891. — Graduated Passages from Greek and Latin Authors for First-Sight Translation. Selected and supplied with short notes for Beginners. By H. Bendall, M. A., Head Master, and C. E. Laurence, B. A., Assistant Master of Blackheath Proprietary School. Part I. Easy. Pp. 87. 1891.

*Verlag der J. G. Cotta'schen Buchhandlung Nachfolger, Stuttgart.* Geschichte der Evangelischen Gottesdienstordnung in Badischen Ländern zugleich ein Beitrag zum Liturgischen Studium von Heinrich Bassermann, Doktor und Professor der Theologie in Heidelberg. Pp. vi, 259. 1891.

